DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 035 CS 210 245

AUTHOR Steele, James; And Others
TITLE The Teaching of Composition: A Study of the Approach to Writing Skills in Ontario Faculties of Education and Teachers' Colleges, Related Surveys, and a Bibliography. Volume II.
INSTITUTION Carleton Univ., Ottawa (Ontario). Dept. of English.
SPONS AGENCY Ontario Ministry of Colleges and Universities, Toronto.
PUB DATE Dec 80
NOTE 271p.; For volumes I and III, see CS 210 244 and CS 210 246, respectively.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Theories; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Literature Reviews; *Preservice Teacher Education; Secondary Education; *Surveys; *Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Qualifications; Teaching Methods; Textbook Content; *Writing Instruction; Writing Research; *Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Ontario

ABSTRACT

Representing the second phase of a study surveying the instructional approach to writing skills in Ontario teacher training institutions as well as secondary composition instruction in general, this volume contains three reviews and a survey. The first review discusses the scope of language arts texts in relation to preservice teacher education courses in seventh and eighth grade composition instruction and addresses problematic aspects of certain language arts texts. The second review contains commentary on some 140 articles and monographs dealing with practical classroom procedures for composition instruction at the secondary level. The main areas covered include prewriting, writing, rewriting, sequential teaching methods, grammar and rhetoric, and responding to writing, followed by a list of works cited. The third review analyzes composition texts approved for use in Ontario's secondary schools, recommending that the Ministry provide financial support for the production of new textbooks in this area. The survey summarizes the replies from Canadian and foreign correspondents about recent research and preservice teacher education programs in their respective institutions, providing detailed information from California, New Zealand, and Scotland. Four recommendations are presented as a result of this evaluation, accompanied by a brief comment indicating their possible relevance to the Ontario system. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED277035

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

THE TEACHING OF COMPOSITION

A STUDY OF THE APPROACH TO WRITING SKILLS IN ONTARIO FACULTIES OF EDUCATION AND TEACHERS' COLLEGES, RELATED SURVEYS, AND A BIBLIOGRAPHY

JAMES STEELE (Principal Investigator)
AVIVA FREEDMAN (Project Co-ordinator)
A.M. BEATTIE
TREVOR BANKS
JAMES DOWNEY
W.R. McGILLIVRAY
ALAN McLAY

and

IAN PRINGLE (Co-investigator)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Aviva Freedman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This research was funded under contract by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, Ontario. It reflects the views of the authors, and not necessarily those of the Ministry.

CS210245

VOLUME II

DECEMBER 1980

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
CARLETON UNIVERSITY
OTTAWA, CANADA

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS
(Volume II)

1. PROBLEMATIC ASPECTS OF A SELECTION OF TEXTS ON TEACHING COMPOSITION AT THE INTERMEDIATE LEVEL (James Steele) / 1

a. Scope of Language Arts Texts in Relation to Intermediate Level Teaching / 3
b. Problematic Aspects of Certain Language Arts Texts / 3

i. Piagetian Developmental Theory / 3
ii. Talking and Writing / 7
iii. Vocabulary Enlargement / 11
iv. Language and Thought / 16

2. A SURVEY OF SOME WORK ON TEACHING COMPOSITION (Trevor Banks and James Steele) / 42
Introduction / 42

i. Prewriting / 45
Assignments / 45
Talking Before Writing / 49
Motivation / 51
Invention / 55
Observation / 56
Detailed Prewriting Procedures / 57
Outlining / 62
The Writier's Audience / 64
Persuasion and the Audience / 66
The "Authentic Voice" Approach / 68
The Journal / 70
Dictation / 72
The "Research" Essay / 73

ii. Writing / 76
Words / 76
Sentences / 78
Punctuation / 80
The Paragraph / 80
Extended Discourse / 86
Tones / 88
Modes / 90
Persuasion / 90

iii. Rewriting / 93
Revising, Drafting, and Checking / 93

iv. Some Classroom Procedures / 98
Some Sequential Approaches / 102
Groups and Workshops / 105

v. Grammar and Rhetoric / 110
Improving Composition Through the Teaching of Grammar / 110
Rhetoric in School Situations / 131

vi. Responding to Writing / 142
A Traditional Procedure / 142
On Not Grading Compositions / 144
Variability of Teacher Grading / 147
Criteria for Evaluating Composition / 151
Commenting on Student Writing / 156
Methods of Marking and Grading / 158
(a) Marking by the Teacher / 158
(b) "Conferences" / 162
(c) Peer-Group Marking / 163
(d) Other Ways of Reducing the Teacher's Marking Burden / 166

vii. Works Cited / 168

3. COMPOSITION TEXTS (A. M. Beattie and A.D. McLay / 175

4. TEACHING COMPOSITION: SOME CURRENT RESEARCH AND PRACTICES IN CANADA AND ABROAD (James Steele) / 189
Introduction / 189

Part I A. Current Research / 196
i. Australia / 196
ii. Canada / 198
iii. Denmark / 208
iv. United Kingdom / 208
v. United States / 211
B. Some Canadian Courses on Teaching Composition / 217
C. Some North-American In-Service Programs / 221
i. Canada / 221
ii. United States / 222

Part II The California Writing Project / 225
A. "A Brief History of the California Writing Project" by George F. Nemetz / 225
B. "The State of Knowledge About Written Composition" by James Gray / 227

Part III New Zealand and Scotland / 238
A. New Zealand
Primary Division / 246
Secondary Division / 246
B. Scotland / 249

CONCLUSION / 263

CHAPTER 1

PROBLEMATIC ASPECTS OF A SELECTION OF TEXTS ON TEACHING COMPOSITION AT THE INTERMEDIATE LEVEL

by

James Steele

This chapter reviews a selection of texts used in Language Arts training courses for preparing teachers to teach at the Intermediate level. This selection does not include texts on Intermediate teaching read in secondary-level training courses as many of these works are discussed in the following chapter.[1] Nor does it include texts devoted exclusively to the teaching of language in the Primary and Junior years--a subject that falls outside the scope of this study. Likewise excluded are school texts of all kinds, works of reference, isolated chapters from texts, and unpublished material. But the selection does include two texts treating language instruction in the first six years of school and one treating the teaching of language in all years from kindergarten to grade thirteen. Such items have been chosen for review because they have clear implications for the teaching of composition at the Intermediate level, and, in certain instances, these implications are made quite explicit. Furthermore, in one or two Language Arts courses, these works are reportedly the ones mainly studied. Compiled below, then, is a list of the various texts selected for consideration. (An asterisk beside a title indicates that the work contains some discussion of procedures for teaching composition specifically at the Intermediate level, even though the main emphasis in the text may be on language instruction in other years.)

Boyd, Gertrude A. Teaching Communication Skills in the Elementary School. Toronto: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1970.

*Michaelis, John Udell, Ruth H. Grossman and Lloyd F. Scott. New Designs for Elementary Curriculum and Instruction. Second Edition. New York: McGraw Hill, 1975.

*Moffett, James and Betty Jane Wagner. Student-centered language arts and reading, k-13: a handbook for teachers. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976.

*Petty, Walter T., Dorothy C. Petty and Marjorie F. Becking. Experiences in Language. 2nd Ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1976.

Rubin, Dorothy. Teaching Elementary Language Arts. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.

*Tiedt, Iris M. and Sidney W. Tiedt. Contemporary English in the Elementary School. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

*Thorn, Elizabeth A. and Carl Braun. Teaching the Language Arts: Speaking, Listening, Reading, Writing. Toronto: Gage, 1974.

As no information was received from instructors about their treatment of texts in courses - a matter which does not fall directly within the terms of reference of this report - there is no reason for not assuming that all of the problems to be discussed below were, in fact, treated by course instructors. Nevertheless, the questions and principles involved are so important that this report would be essentially incomplete without a consideration of them. This chapter will therefore consist of (a) a preliminary observation about the general scope of the texts and (b) comments on problematic questions that are only alluded to in the survey of works on teaching composition in the following chapter. These questions have to do with four, interrelated topics: (i) Piagetian assumptions about mental development, (ii) the relation between talking and writing, (iii) vocabulary enlargement, and (iv) the relation between language and thought. Although the texts under consideration treat each of these matters with somewhat different emphases, certain propositions common to almost all texts can be easily identified. It should be noted, however, that one exceptional text, which is studied in courses at three faculties, describes promising teaching procedures with little reference to these problematic questions. This extraordinary text is Petty, Petty and Becking's Experiences in Language, a work will will not be discussed in part (b) below.

(a) The scope of the language-arts texts in relation to Intermediate-level teaching

As noted above, the texts under discussion deal primarily or exclusively with the teaching of language arts in grades other than 7 and 8. The text by Petty, Petty and Becking, which discusses language teaching from Grades 1 to 8, has the fullest discussion of teaching composition at the Intermediate level, but its treatment is by no means comprehensive. Two works, those by Thorn and Braun and by Tiedt and Tiedt, briefly discuss extending to the Intermediate level principles and procedures recommended for use in earlier grades. Moffett and Wagner describe a series of "growth sequences" ranging from "k to 13" and offer an array of activities for fostering development in relation to these sequences. There is little discussion in their text, however, of procedures and problems particularly relevant to the Intermediate-level years. The two remaining texts listed above--Boyd's and Rubin's - deal directly only with Grades 1 to 6. Thus there seems to be a need for a text or manual offering a comprehensive discussion of problems, principles and procedures particularly relevant to the Intermediate level.

Recommendation

We accordingly recommend that the Ministry support the preparation of new texts on the teaching of language at the Intermediate level and that such texts include a detailed treatment of the teaching of composition from Grades 7 to 10.

(b) Problematic aspects of certain language-arts texts

(i) Piagetian developmental theory

Principles of language teaching in the texts under discussion are based partly on a theory of intellectual development advanced by the Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget.[2] According to Piaget's well-known hypothesis about child growth, the human mind develops from birth to adulthood in three intellectual stages: the "sensori-motor" period

(from birth to 18 months), the "concrete operational" period (from 18 months to 11 years), and the "formal operational" period (from 11 years to adulthood). In each stage, the child is said to reconstruct mentally aspects of its adaptive actions, and each stage of mental growth has its own peculiar mode of symbolic representation and logic. Piaget argues that, while language can be used "symbolically" by a child in performing these "operations," language cannot, in itself, be a source of thought. The basis for thought, he maintains, lies in the reconstructive operations themselves, which are essentially metalinguistic.

The Piagetian theory of development has, of course, necessary implications for the practice of language teaching. One of these is that children younger than eleven (who have not reached their third stage of intellectual growth) are too mentally undeveloped to make logical inferences in their thinking and therefore in their language - a mental condition which Piaget attempts to explain in terms of intellectual "egocentrism." Another is that the learning of language can in itself contribute little to cognitive development. The language-arts texts under review seem to accept both these implications with remarkably little qualification.

The text by Thorn and Braun, to be sure, briefly discusses L. S. Vygotsky's well-known critique of Piaget's hypothesis and even mentions Vygotsky's counter-proposition that the learning of language makes a critically important contribution to the development of cognition. But the authors of this text appear to misunderstand some of Vygotsky's basic arguments while recommending a so-called "middle position" that really fails to reconcile the main differences between the two theorists.[3] This "middle position," which (as the authors note) was originally advanced by E. Brooks Smith and others,[4] is based on the notion that "dialogue between teacher and child is the best way of bridging the intellectual difference that exists between them." Although this doctrine (whatever its intrinsic merits) may not be entirely inconsistent with Piaget's hypothesis, it is certainly irrelevant, if not contrary, to Vygotsky's. The point of Vygotsky's argument is that the cognitive development of school-age children

depends especially on the study of language in the contexts of specific cultural and scientific disciplines.[5] Although such formal instruction must take into consideration children's spontaneous or naive modes of thinking and speaking, which are analyzed in some detail by Vygotsky,[6] the clear implication of his argument is that "dialogue" as a linguistic form of speech activity can contribute relatively little to the development of cognition after about the age of seven, by which time the basic patterns of both dialogic speech and inner speech are well established in the brain. A further implication is that dialogic speech among children of school age that displaces the learning of language in disciplinary contexts can actually retard cognitive development. Although Vygotsky occasionally uses the word "dialogue" to denote systematic instruction, the text by Thorn and Braun does not use this term in this particular sense. Furthermore, the pedagogical practices recommended in this text seem to be based as squarely on Piagetian postulates as the practices recommended in the other texts under review. The "middle position" described by Thorn and Braun cannot therefore be taken as a valid qualification of the Piagetian theory.

Is Piaget's theory, then, as firmly established as the language-arts texts suggest? Evidence to the contrary has come from a series of experimental studies carried out by Scottish investigators. In fact, the results of these experiments appear to be so conclusive that at least two of Piaget's postulates now seem quite untenable. One of these is the proposition that children's minds are characterized by a logical "egocentrism" that makes them think syncretistically and renders them incapable of making deductive inferences. The other is the idea that the development of human cognition is not significantly affected by the learning of language. Both propositions, of course, had been criticized on theoretical grounds by Vygotsky some fifty years ago. Vygotsky's critique of Piaget, however, was less than conclusive because it did not explain the verifiable results of Piaget's "conservation" experiments. It was only when Margaret Donaldson and her Scottish colleagues discovered that results contrary to those of

Piaget could be obtained simply by altering the situational and linguistic contexts of Piaget's own experiments that the inadequacy of certain aspects of Piaget's theory became apparent.

A detailed report of this remarkable re-experimentation is given by Margaret Donaldson in Children's Minds.[7] Donaldson also discusses the pedagogical implications of this re-assessment of Piaget, especially for the teaching of language. Her conclusion is that the young child is probably much more capable of logical thought than Piagetian theory indicates and that the mental development depends partly on the way in which language is learned and taught at school. Donaldson suggests that instruction which fosters a rational and conscious understanding of the systematic elements of language may be critically important for the subsequent mastery of abstract or "disembedded" modes of thinking.

The sociolinguistic arguments of M. A. K. Halliday also seem fundamentally inconsistent with Piaget's theory of intellectual growth and language. Halliday's studies of child development, published collectively as Explorations in the Functions of Language[8] and Learning How to Mean: Explorations in the Development of Language,[9] do not comment directly on Piaget. Nevertheless, Halliday's detailed observations about the structures of cognition inherent in language's lexicogrammatical system seem quite incompatible with Piaget's reductive view of language. Only one language-arts text under review, Thorn and Braun's, considers the implications of Halliday's theory. This text, however, overlooks Halliday's main argument about the complex, lexicogrammatical organization of post-infant speech while suggesting that Halliday's taxonomy of pre-sentence, infant utterances would suffice for a functional analysis of the speech of the school-child.

The language-arts texts under review thus seem to have adopted, more or less uncritically, questionable Piagetian hypotheses about the development of cognition and the role of language in higher mental processes.[10]

Recommendation

We therefore recommend that Language Arts instructors in the Faculties of Education invite student-teachers to consider evidence that widely accepted Piagetian postulates concerning the function of language in mental development may be untenable.

(ii) Talking and Writing

Several of the language-art texts under discussion suggest that practice in talking, an activity which is said to involve the exercise of the two skills of speaking and listening, can be an effective means of improving the writing ability of students.[11] Traditionally, of course, composition teachers have recommended the oral discussion of a particular topic as a useful preparation for writing about it; the language-arts texts, however, postulate that the four language arts (speaking, listening, reading and writing) are so closely interrelated that practice in almost any kind of talking is likely to have a beneficial effect on writing. This conclusion appears to be based on two related assumptions. In all texts, oral speech is typically defined as the most "basic" form of language, the implication being that writing is a graphic recoding of oral speech and therefore a secondary derivate. In some texts, there is a further supposition that the cultivation of the personally "expressive" element in talk is especially conducive to the development of writing skills.

The first of these assumptions is problematic, if not sectarian. It is true, of course, that many linguists in recent decades have focused much of their attention on oral speech rather than on writing. It is also true that some linguists, notably Leonard Bloomfield and his followers in the United States, have argued that human language is oral speech. But many knowledgeable scholars, both within the United States and elsewhere, have found this definition less than satisfactory. They have suggested, on the contrary, that language is essentially a culturally transmitted system of complex, interrelated units of meaning (or sememes), which can be represented by two different systems of

signification. One system uses the sounds of the tongue, and the other the written marks of pictograph, ideograph or alphabet. Although these two systems for symbolizing language were in man's early history quite unconnected with each other, a close relationship between the two modes of signification is said to have developed later in certain cultures, including our own. This relationship is based primarily on the alphabetization of oral speech, on the phoneticization of writing, and on the consequent sharing by the two significatory systems of many lexical items and certain features of grammar. It is also based on the fact that alphabetical writing is initially learned by each individual as a second-order sign system. Yet, despite these common elements, oral speech and written speech are still so different that they constitute, it is argued, two equal and independent modes of signification.[12]

The basic difference between these two systems is explained in terms of their respective functions. On the one hand, oral speech is typically only one element - and often a subordinate element - in a situation that pre-establishes such important conditions as the identity of speaker and audience, the occasion, and even, sometimes, the subject-matter and purpose of an utterance. Interlocutory oral speech therefore consists typically of comparatively brief, unelaborated and elliptical units, elements of which are variously linked partly by the syntax of language and partly by the non-verbal, demonstrative "syntax" of a whole speech-act situation. Written speech, on the other hand, functions independently of concrete situations and is therefore organized differently. It typically establishes the conditions of an utterance within its own self-contained, self-explanatory context, and it does so by exclusively linguistic means. It thus creates contextually the identity of a writer, either personal or impersonal, whose presence, tone and attitude are maintained through a verbal texture formed in accordance with conventions peculiar to the written mode. Written speech likewise establishes implicitly, through text and "sub-text," features of an absent audience that may be unfamiliar, universal, or even imaginary. The conventions of writing further require that the subject-matter of a text be elaborated to a degree that is exactly appropriate for the comprehension of this

hypothetical audience. If textual economy and precision are required, this elaboration involves selecting words from the whole lexicon of the language, a vocabulary that differs in size and scope from the oral vocabulary of educated speakers. Moreover, the coherence and force of written speech - those qualities of discourse that constitute important aspects of its rationality - are achieved to a large extent by syntactical, logical, and grammatical forms peculiar to texts that invite a repeated perusal of "thema" and "rhema." To differentiate in this way between oral speech and written speech is not to suggest that what is essentially oral speech cannot be written down or that written speech cannot be uttered orally. Rather, it is to argue that the two systems of signification, while sharing some elements, have fundamentally different organizing principles. From this argument, it would follow that, just as practice in writing cannot begin to suffice as a means of learning oral speech, practice in talking is quite inadequate as a means of learning the systematic features of the written mode.

The second assumption, which oncerns the value of the expressive element in in talk, is likewise problematic. Certain theorists, notably James Britton and James Moffett, have maintained that the development of writing abilities depends to a large degree on a learner's having ample practice in personally expressive conversations.[13] Talking of this kind is said to create a strong psychological basis for learning how to write in the language of all disciplines "across the curriculum." Personally expressive conversations should thus precede writing personally about a subject, and writing of this personal kind should, in turn, prepare the way for writing with varying degrees of either "poetic" detachment of "transactional" participation.

This analysis of the developmental function of oral speech is inconsistent, however, with conclusions reached by other investigators. Jeannette Williams, for example, has astutely criticized the epistemological assumptions underlying this theory, the vagueness of its terminology, and the reliability of the experimental evidence advanced

by Britton and others in support of it.[14] M. A. K. Halliday, arguing from a sociolinguistic perspective, has suggested that virtually all post-infant human language necessarily includes a personal element, which is, in fact, a part of the language's grammatical structure.[15] What school-age children therefore need in order to learn to write is not the ability to talk expressively, which can be taken for granted, but an awareness of the possible functions of writing and an ability to appreciate "types of meaning" that are proper to the writing system in the specific contexts studied at school.[16]

In a more distant part of the world, A. K. Markova and her colleagues at the U.S.S.R. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences have concluded after many years of study that the early developmental relationship between talking and writing becomes reversed when children reach school at about the age of seven.[17] According to their argument, which takes for granted systematic differences between oral speech and written speech, the expressive, yet hesitantly fragmented, oral speech of juveniles gradually develops into the fluently coherent, oral speech of the literate adult partly as a result of the transference to oral speech of certain features of the written mode. In other words, the child learns how to talk well partly by learning how to write well. In the United States, some fifty experimental studies of various aspects of the relationship between oral speech and written speech have also been carried out. A recent review of this work concludes that, although the evidence is somewhat contradictory, it fails to establish the proposition that the teaching of oral skills is an efficient means of developing competence in writing.[18]

As the discussion in the language-arts texts of the relation between oral and written speech is thus based on questionable premises,

Recommendation

we recommend that Language Arts instructors in the Faculties of Education inform student-teachers of disagreements among theorists

as to the effectiveness of talking as a means of developing skill in writing.

(iii) Vocabulary Enlargement

All language-arts texts under review recommend the teaching of certain techniques for recognizing, analysing, and comprehending words as literal signs. The enlargement of vocabulary - a matter of some importance to the development of writing skill - is likewise discussed but primarily in terms of one or two general principles. Specifically, all texts link vocabulary enlargement to Piaget's theory of intellectual development. As one text typically argues, a student can "acquire vocabulary only as he can grasp the concepts denoted, and this understanding will depend on worldly experience and logical development."[19] Several texts qualify this first principle by a second, which suggests that students be given systematic instruction in the spelling of a basic core of some 3,500 words that are said to account for 95% of the words used in writing and therefore 95% of the vocabulary that a student will "ever require." "Beyond this point," Thorn and Braun explain, "vocabulary requirements become highly individualized, and it would be uneconomical in terms of time and effort to expand the basic list to include more than 3,000 or 4,000 words. Teachers must assume reponsibility for supplementing the basic word lists on an individual and class basis to take care of words of special interest." This supplementary vocabulary, it is later asserted, will consist primarily of the "specialized meanings, technical terms and difficult words" encountered in each subject; consequently, "teachers of each subject must assume responsibility for teaching these three categories of words."

The two principles summarized above are problematic for several reasons. The first proposition, which links vocabulary enlargement to Piaget's theory of intellectual growth, is questionable precisely because, as noted in section (ii) above, there is strong evidence that the Piagetian hypothesis is based partly on a serious misunderstanding of the role of language in mental development. Moreover, this

principle fails to take into account certain neurolinguistic findings (to be discussed in section (iv) below) which indicate that human language, as it is learned, becomes an integral part of cognition itself. Unqualified acceptance of this Piagetian principle has, of course, important practical implications. If a knowledge of words is unrelated to mental development, there can be little reason for studying their properties. If the learning of words is simply the function of a natural process, then vocabulary enlargement need scarcely be considered in a language-arts curriculum.

The second principle, which holds that the systematic study of vocabulary should be initially based on a core spelling-list of 3,000 to 4,000 words and then extended by the incidental learning of additional words as they are encountered in the study of each subject, seems to be premised on an argument that is as questionable as it is equivocal. A vocabulary of 3,000 to 4,000 words can account for ninety-five per cent of the words that a writer will "ever require" only in relation to the total number of words, including repetitions, that a writer is likely to use. A vocabulary of this small a magnitude, however, can scarcely begin to account for what a writer may "require"--and need to know--in order to convey meaning with economy and precision. This requirement can be measured only in relation to all lexical items in common use, regardless of their frequency of occurrence. Unfortunately, the language-arts textbooks make little reference to this second "requirement," a sine qua non for writing well.

A few numerical considerations can serve to place in comparative perspective the orders of magnitude distinguishing these two requirements. The basic 3,000 word core-vocabulary, which has been identified through the word-count surveys of such investigators as Henry Rinsland and Ernest Horn in the United States and by Ves Thomas in Canada, typically consists of those words that occur most frequently in the compositions of children and in the business-prose of adults. Even within this core, the range in word-use frequency is vast. Horn, for example, found that in adult writing only 100 words account for 59%

of all words used; some 500 words account of 82%; 1,000 for 90%; and 2,000 for 95%. Rinsland, in his count, found a similar range of frequencies. The survey conducted by Edward L. Thorndike and Irving Lorge[20] provides an even broader perspective for judging the significance of the counts of Rinsland, Horn and Thomas. This more comprehensive survey noted the frequency of occurrence of the 30,000 most-frequently-used words in a broad sample of non-technical prose written for adults. Thorndike and Lorge found that the first most-frequently-used 1,000 words in the language occur at least 100 times or more per million, but that the second 1,000 words occur only 51 to 99 times per million - or with a frequency of about .000051% to .000099%. The third most-frequently-used 1,000 words likewise occur with a somewhat smaller frequency of .000030% to .000049%. It is thus evident from the Thorndike-Lorge survey that those words which occur less than 3% of the time in non-technical, non-specialist, adult reading matter constitute nothing less than 95% of the most commonly-used 30,000 words in the language.

The Thorndike-Lorge list, it can be noted, represents only about 10% of the 300,000 or 400,000 words that are in a large dictionary and a somewhat larger percentage of the 70,000 headwords that can be found in a more concise lexicon. This list likewise contains about double the number of words indexed in a small thesaurus and about two-thirds the number indexed in a large one. It is about equal to the vocabulary of Shakespeare's writing (29,066 words) and only slightly larger than the vocabulary which Lorge found in a selection of popular magazines written for an American, non-specialist audience. It contains only a few thousand more words than were counted by Thorndike in 120 works of juvenile literature recommended for reading by students from grades three to eight. Typical of the least-frequently-occurring 1,000 words in Throndike's 30,000 word list are the following items, all having 'ab' as their first two letters: abduct, aberration, abettor, abiding, abloom, abnegation, abnormality, abortion, above-board, abrasion, abscond, absolutism, absorptive, abstemious, abstention, abut, and abysm.

As proficiency in writing requires a capacity to select appropriate words, regardless of frequency of use, from nothing less than the lexicon of the language, no limit can be reasonably placed on the vocabulary that a writer may, in practice, "require." As Ernest Horn has rightly remarked, a 3,000- to 4,000-word core vocabulary should be regarded as nothing more than the "security segment" of even the spelling curriculum.[21] The relevant pedagogical question, then, is how to ensure that a reasonable degree of familiarity with a copious range of the language's lexicon is achieved.

This is a matter about which the language-arts texts seem to offer less than adequate advice. As noted above, natural mental development cannot suffice in this task, especially if such development is regarded as essentially wordless. Nor can practice in oral speech give the required knowledge. Although a child will learn orally several thousand words even before attending school, oral vocabulary differs in scope from the vocabulary of written speech (especially written speech in its standard edited form) and the vocabulary of children's oral speech represents only a fraction of the language's lexicon.[22] Likewise, the casual study of "difficult" words encountered by pupils in texts on various subjects across the curriculum, however necessary and useful such word-study may be, is unequal to the larger task. As Stephen Leacock suggested many years ago in his sad tale of "A,B and C,"[23] the functional prose of many texts lacks qualities that can make the contextual study of words in all their nuances a matter of memorable delight. Furthermore, the young reader's ability to understand texts containing "technical" or "specialized" terms often depends on a prior knowledge of a wide range of common, non-technical words.[24] Relegating vocabulary enlargement to the incidental study of unfamiliar words in such texts thus runs the risk of both impeding the study of "technical" or "specialized" subject-matter and failing to provide engaging contexts for the study of ordinary language.

If it can be assumed that a copious vocabulary should be a central aim of instruction, then the principal means of achieving this goal must surely be found not within disciplines for which language is a matter of secondary importance but within the only discipline which has

for its proper subject-matter the study of language itself - its elements, forms, uses, and creations. Within the context of English studies, to be sure, the enlargement of vocabulary can be contextually planned and economically organized. Such studies can take into consideration virtually any word used anywhere in the curriculum; they can also - and this is their great advantage - link the study of words to the reading of texts of literary merit that are designed to arouse intense interest and to give memorable pleasure. Literature, after all, consists by definition of any kind of writing on any subject as long as the work is so well made that its perfect use of language both enlightens and delights. The reading and study of words in such engagingly rich contexts can, of course, be supplemented by systematic study of their elements and relationships, a field of knowledge which likewise belongs properly to English as a subject and to no other discipline.[25] Furthermore, English studies can ensure that study of words and practice in using them thoughtfully are effectively conjoined.

Designing such a program for use at the Intermediate level is obviously a complex and difficult task - a work that requires imagination, intelligence, and a wealth of practical class-room experience. As the language-arts texts under review offer little specific guidance as to either the form or substance of such instruction,

Recommendation

we recommend that new texts on teaching language at the Intermediate level include a detailed treatment of vocabulary enlargement and its relation to the reading of literature, the study of words, and the mastery of composition.

Recommendation

We also recommend that the Ministry's Curriculum Guideline for the Intermediate Division: English be revised to include a detailed discussion of vocabulary enlargement as an instructional goal.

(iv) Language and Thought

The study of relations between mind, language, and external reality necessarily involves epistemological and philosophical questions that are of fundamental importance to an understanding of man. For this reason, the relationship between thought and language has been analyzed by nearly all humane disciplines. It is, for example, a common topic of philosophy from Aristotle to Wittgenstein, of literary criticism from Plato to Lukács, of translation-theory from Dryden to Steiner, of psychology from Hobbes to Leontyev, and of anthropology from Sapir to Lévi-Strauss. Although the authors of the language-arts texts recognize rightly the relevance of the language-thought relationship to paedeutics, a remarkable feature of their discussion is the unquestioned assumption that this matter can be best understood in terms of arguments derived almost exclusively from two recently developed fields of study - cybernetic communications theory and neo-behaviourist psychology. After a brief summary of these arguments and some of their implications, it will be suggested below that the communications-behaviourist theory not only overlooks traditional humanist propositions concerning the relationship between language and thought but also does not take into consideration relevant physiological evidence described in recent years by investigators in the field of neurolinguistics.

The communications theory that appears to be taken for granted in the language-arts texts under discussion and that now provides a categorical term for all language study at the secondary level has for its proper subject-matter the analysis of control systems in human organizations, biological organisms, and mechanical devices. This theory, originally formulated by Norbert Wiener, is especially concerned with the features common to all such systems and with mathematical descriptions of their operations. It accordingly postulates that "thinking" in any kind of control system, including the human brain, can be understood in terms of the "processing" of quantitative units of "information." Within such a system, the main function of "language" - whether used by a computer, a medium of social

communication, or a brain neuron - is essentially to provide a "code" for converting "messages" into signals that can be systematically analysed or processed. In a similiar and somewhat analogous way, neo-behaviourist psychology also postulates that human thinking is essentially the functioning of a biological system as it produces a "response" to a "stimulus." Between the incoming "stimulus" (input) and the outgoing "response" (output), two mediating "operations" can, in certain instances, occur in order to facilitate the formation of a repeatable response or "skill." One is the formation of non-verbal, mental "concepts," and the other is the use of language to label such "concepts" as they are formed. As these mediating processes correspond respectively to the "processing" and "coding" operations defined by communications theory, the two theories are closely analogous to each other.

The language-arts texts accordingly assume that a "concept" can consist of any group of stimuli having recognized common characteristics. Such entities are said to have their origin in "experience," although their specific structure may be shaped by the biological determinants of mental development, especially those described by Piaget. The term "concept," furthermore, is often used more or less synonymously for "idea" and "thought." Language, the main element in the second mediating operation, is frequently referred to as a "code." It is described as a conventional, learned, arbitrary means of "naming" or "labeling" of "concepts" in order to facilitate "communication." Linguistic signals thus make possible the transmission between human beings of a "message," which can be translated back into "concepts" by anyone knowing the language "code." Language is therefore variously defined in the texts as a "tool of communication," a "means of communication," a "vehicle of thought," a "tool of thought," and a "medium of thought" - all definitions being instrumental with respect to language's coding function in the conveyance of conceptual information.[26]

The teaching and learning of language is consequently discussed in terms of four sets of "communication skills," which are said to constitute the "language arts." The signaling function of each art is, of course, heavily stressed: two of them - speech and writing - are

presented as techniques for the "encoding" of ideas; the other two - listening and reading - are described as procedures for the "decoding" of messages. As all four arts use one and the same linguistic sign system, their interrelatedness is emphasized. Although one or two texts note the possibility that these sets of skills may, in their mediating role, affect the formation of "concepts" by providing either cues for their production or forms for their combination, this suggestion is not developed. The relation between thought and language - or between "conceptualization" and "verbalization" - is generally assumed to be as tenuous as it is arbitrary. The model, in other words, is rigorously dualistic.

Some texts, to be sure, qualify this neo-behaviourist argument with references to Noam Chomsky's neo-rationalist, "nativist" theory of linguistic competence.[27] Particularly relevant is Chomsky's proposition that speech is the product of a "language-acquisition device" which is a part of every child's in-born "conceptual equipment." According to Chomsky, the sentences of an infant derive their "deep" structure from a universal grammar that never needs to be consciously learned by man in order to be used.

While Chomsky's theory has cast new light on possible relations between the "deep" structures of clauses (which Chomsky assumes are innate) and the various syntactical forms of their "surface" representations, it begs two questions of fundamental importance concerning the relationship between thought and language. In the first place, it does not account for the origins of deep structures themselves. Chomsky simply assumes that, for purposes of understanding the formal nature of language, the meanings of words can be reduced to the categorial features of parts of speech. In his view, other "semantic components" originate in "concepts" that are as essentially metalinguistic as the concepts of behaviourist psychology. Chomsky's asemantic and alexical description of linguistic competence thus implies a link between thought and language that is almost an tenuous as the one postulated by neo-behaviourist psychology.

Secondly, Chomsky's innateness postulate seems to rule out the possibility that deep linguistic structures can function in cognition as something other than a priori mental forms. Yet there are plausible arguments suggesting that such structures may, in fact, be explicable as reflections of man's actions--of his experience as a subject acting on objects in a language-using community. The findings of Donaldson and Halliday noted above point generally in this direction. Equally relevant are the arguments advanced more specifically on this point by Donald Hebb, Jerome Bruner, and A. R. Luria.[28] None of these arguments, it can be noted, is based on the mechanistic behaviourism of B. F. Skinner, which Chomsky also has rightly rejected. All of them suggest that any reflection mediated by language is probably a result of both ontogenetic and phylogenetic experience. Such reflection, in other words, appears to have its roots not only in pre-verbal or semi-verbal, "situational" cognition; it also originates in a sharing, from infancy, of concepts, categories, and generalizations inherent in language itself as an historically formed system of meanings.

Chomsky's qualification notwithstanding, the communications-behaviourist model of the relation between thought and language has many implications for instruction. The model suggests--and this suggestion is also supported by Piaget's developmental hypothesis--that words should be learned to name or label concepts once they have been formed. The texts do not therefore recommend that aspects of word meaning be studied as a practical means of forming and developing concepts, the emphasis being rather on "learning experiences" that give the child ample and varied stimuli. (Such experiences can, of course, be of a verbal nature, in which case they would involve the receiving of information indirectly by means of language signs.) This model further stipulates that the sound system of speech constitutes the most basic form of the language code. Language instruction at the elementary and lower intermediate levels (Grades 1 to 8) should therefore place a greater emphasis on speaking and listening than on reading and writing. The texts argue, in fact, that the oral-aural arts offer the most efficient means of learning language itself and of transmitting stimulating ideas.

The coding and decoding operations required for speaking and listening can also be used in reading and writing. Reading is assumed to be a process involving the application of word-perception and word-interpretation skill to a text in order to extract its twice-coded "information." Even the reading of imaginative literature is explained in terms of this process. The information it provides can consist of moral "values" and "qualities" of form, or (in the case of Moffett and Wagner) symbolic structures that correspond to innate structures of cognition. Literature thus offers a supplement to other sources of information.

Writing is likewise to be treated as a "communication process." It involves the conceptualization, coding, and transmission of messages that can be received, decoded, and concerted back into concepts by readers. As every child is said to have a natural ability to form concepts and to code them in oral speech, instruction in writing should ensure mastery of the written code. It should also invite the learner to carry out pre- and post-writing activities that facilitate the "writing process." These would ordinarily include preparatory "experiences" to foster the formation of concepts, a consideration of the probable effects of various "rhetorical strategies," "decision-making" with respect to conceptual and stylistic options, and a consideration of "feedback" from an audience. Motivation to carry out these activities in a thoughtful manner and for clear purposes should be based on a sense of personal involvement. Hints from teachers and help from peers can be given as required to further this natural process of language use. Although the texts do not assert that a broad and deep knowledge of language is not a <u>desideratum</u>, they do not treat such learning as an instructional goal. Similarly, the systematic study of theory about language--grammar, logic, and rhetoric--is not recommended.

Although this kind of instruction accommodates several practices traditionally followed by composition teachers (who have taken for granted the communicative function of language), its basic assumption that language itself can contribute little or nothing to cognition and

to man's higher mental processes is questionable. Such an assumption is certainly inconsistent with cogent humanist arguments about the work of language in cognition and reflection. Furthermore, it does not take into consideration persuasive neurolinguistic evidence that natural language, as it is learned, mediates in all cognition and becomes the mind's dominant system for the organization of mental operations. Both humanist scholars and neurolinguists have suggested, in fact, that the reflexive and reflective function of language is as important as its communicative function. If this conclusion is sound, the learning of language must be regarded as a means of developing human intellect, and learned language as a form of human consciousness.

Humanist arguments have taken two forms, one of which is essentially critical. Literary scholars, conceding that the information-processing model of thinking may have heuristic uses in the methods of certain disciplines, have nevertheless argued that the postulates basic to such a model scarcely begin to account for the scope, depth, order and subtlety of man's use of natural language.[29] In their view, language is an integral part of thought, and any theory purporting to explain human intellect must come to terms with man's achievements in language. This argument, to be sure, does not claim that all uses of language are necessarily thoughtful. Nor does it assert that certain kinds of mental activity cannot occur without the use of word-meanings, or that word-meanings are the only elements of cognition. But it does claim that any definition of language which limits its function to communication is radically incomplete.

A second kind of humanist argument--a general theory of language--was advanced early in this century by Ferdinand de Saussure in his Cours de linguistique générale.[30] Although a detailed discussion of Saussure's well-known work falls outside the scope of this review, one or two Saussurian principles that have a direct bearing on pedagogical aspects of the thought-language problem can be briefly noted.

Saussure's fundamental distinction between "language" (langue) and "speech" (langage) is certainly relevant. Language, according to this

theorist, is essentially a self-contained system of classification which constitutes the lexico-grammatical organization of speech. The basic elements of this system are linguistic signs, each sign being a "bilateral" entity uniting a signifying "sound-image" and a signified "concept." The system as a whole is the product of a community's socio-historical experience and exists perfectly only as a social fact. Saussure thus suggests that language is not a function of the individual but a product that is assimilated by a speaker without premeditation. Speech, on the other hand, is a psycho-physiological activity involving the practical use of aspects of language for the purpose of communication. Speech is therefore only a manifestation of language even though language as a system can be learned only by means of speech.

The basic components of the language system proper are units of meaning (words and their phrasal equivalents). According to Saussure, relations and differences among these units generate two interdependent sub-systems--"syntagms" and "associative series"--which are brought creatively into play in the formation of an utterance. A syntagm is defined as any sequential or discursive combination of two or more language units in a regular syntactical pattern, the sentence being a typical structure of this kind. An "associative series" (or "paradigm" as it was later called) is essentially a non-sequential word group of indeterminate order that exists psychologically outside of discourse. It can be formed on the basis of inflectional patterns (declensions, conjugations, etc.), common formative elements (roots, prefixes, suffixes), similar signification (synomymy), similar sound-images (homonymy), or contrastive signification (antonymy). It can also be based on relations of subordination and superordination among signified ideas. Relations of this kind form definitional associations of genus, species and differentia. They also reflect hierarchical categories in a language's general system of nominations. Topical lexicons and thesauri are based on relations of this sort, and Saussure suggests that paradigmatic formations also characterize the psychological organization of language. As linguistic signs are thus interdependent, Saussure suggests knowledge of any part of language depends on a

knowledge, however imperfect, of language as a whole. This point is not appreciated in the language-arts texts under review.

Another Saussurian principle having important pedagogical implications concerns the properties of the linguistic sign as a conceptual entity. Although Saussure's definition of the linguistic sign as the union of a concept and a sound-image is original, he suggests conventionally that the conceptual substance of a linguistic sign typically includes both a denotative idea of an object and connotative properties that constitute conditions for determining a sign's sphere of application. Saussure observes, however, that a verbal concept is not the same as a non-verbal concept. The distinction between them does not depend on the fact that a verbal concept, unlike a non-verbal concept, is a relatively stable entity tacitly agreed to by a language community and reported summarily in dictionaries and lexicons. The distinction must be made because the meaning of a verbal concept is qualified and partly defined by other concepts in the language system. In other words, a linguistic sign has both a conceptual value (as a representation of an idea) and a system-dependent signification which partly determines that same value. Because a non-verbal concept is unrelated to language's system of nominations, it does not have a value of this kind and is therefore merely an indeterminate "abstraction." More generally, the same consideration distinguishes a language from a nomenclature.[31] If Saussure is right, a word is not simply a name for a concept that exists independently of the language system; and learning a language is not a process of giving names to pre-formed abstractions as the texts under review suggest.

The epistemological implications of Saussure's structuralist analysis of language are still being elaborated and qualified.[32] It now seems clear that man uses the linguistic sign not only as a speech-sign (oral or written) but also as a language-sign for the representation of meaning in reflective cognition. These two modes of word-use mutually affect and inform each other in many ways. For example, the speech-sign, as Saussure observes, can be a means of learning certain aspects of the potential significance of a corresponding language-sign;

and speech patterns can suggest ways of ordering language-signs in thought. Likewise, the meaningful "semic" language-sign can be one determinant (along with other conditions of an utterance) of the semantic value of a corresponding speech-sign; and mentally formed relationships among language-signs can provide a possible basis for utterance form. But, as Anna Ufimtseva has cogently argued, the cognitive use of the word as a language-sign is primary and basic, and its communicative use as a speech-signal, secondary and derivative.[33] In cognition, the language-sign, particularly the nominative sign, functions reflexively and denotatively (as indeed does the speech-sign to a lesser degree in a communicative utterance) in order to represent a notion of a phenomenon. It thus contributes to the complex process of objectification--the development of an awareness of a particular object and its specific features. It can also represent generalizations about its denotation by virtue of its capacity to include within its signification connotative conditions relating to the essential and accidental properties of a denoted phenomenon.[34] Moreover, because a linguistic concept is part of a system of nominations, it classifies what it represents and, at the same time, acquires a specific systemic value. These categorizing and generalizing properties of language, the learning of which continues throughout life, make for the uniqueness of each word as a language-sign, its intricate richness of texture, its delicate precision, and its heuristic potential in the mental formation of meaning.

As well as thus mentally representing things with denotative, connotative, and semiological meaning, the language-sign can also be used simultaneously for purposes of predication. In other words, even while the language-sign functions referentially, it can also serve to establish new relations with other signs and so to form correspondingly new meanings. The nominative and predicative potentials of the language-sign can thus be brought reflectively into play for purposes of either analysis or synthesis -- two basic modes of higher cognition -- prior to the articulation of an utterance. These marvelous qualities of the language-sign make it possible for it to be used for understanding the structure of any code and even of language itself. More generally, these qualities constitute just some of the properties

that distinguish the semic word-in-thought from the semantic word-in-speech and natural language as a whole from all other signaling systems.

Humane philosophers have accordingly concluded that, although language is only a part of cognition, it enables man to apprehend and interpret virtually any phenomenon and to reach profoundly true levels of understanding about the nature of things, even when such levels seem infinitely far removed from, or contradicted by, direct sensory experience. Language-in-thought is thus assumed to be not merely a "vehicle" for ideas but the completed form of the ideas themselves, not merely an instrument of thought but an essential part of reflection. Human speech may be a signaling system comprising four practical arts of communication, but language is also an element of mind and, as such, worthy of cultivation as an end in itself. Propositions such as these and their paedeutic implications are given little consideration in the language-arts texts.

Humanist arguments for the proposition that there is a close connection between language and human consciousness have thus been based partly on analyses (by means of language) of the uses of language in certain texts and partly on reflections (by means of language) on the linguistic nature of reflection itself. These arguments have also been reinforced by criticisms of the neo-behaviourist model of communication--a theory which is said to account for the complex functions of language in terms that are reductively simplistic. Although the humanist case must be judged on its merits, it has recently received unexpected support from a rather distant quarter--the field of neuropsychology. As the language-arts texts under review make no mention of conclusions reached by investigators in this field, a brief account of some of their findings may be in order.

The work of two theorists, Karl H. Pribram and A. R. Luria, is especially pertinent in this regard. Pribram, on the basis of neurological evidence, has suggested that learned language forms a cerebral system not only for the storage and communication of information but

also for its analysis by the brain. While noting that thinking is "not solely a linguistic enterprise," he nevertheless argues that words become thought when used cerebrally to explore the symbolic rightness or wrongness of perceptions. The linguistic unit which carries out this heuristic, cerebral function is, he suggests, the verbal proposition, the constituent elements of which are simultaneously both designative signs and predicative symbols. Pribram argues, as a biologist, that the gradual historical accrual of such propositional communications by a society constitutes a human language, and that the natural ability of the human brain to solve problems cannot be fully realized without this culturally transmitted cerebral facility.[35]

A. R. Luria has likewise concluded, on the basis of extraordinary physiological evidence discovered through the study of brain lesions, that speech is both an elaborate expressive-impressive signaling system and a "complex and specifically organized form of conscious activity."[36] This activity, however, has its immediate origin in the partly automatic (and therefore partly unconscious) formation of word schemata, which, according to Luria, constitute the "deepest" basis for all syntactic structures, including even the "deep" generative syntactical forms described by Chomsky. Such schemata have a critically important function within a cerebral problem-solving system that involves the concerted working of many other parts of the brain; likewise, man's speech system contributes to the work of many other cerebral systems, including those for memory, visual perception, the organization of attention, and the regulation of behaviour. According to Luria, the logico-semantic properties of words function as seminal elements in any schema; in fact, as knowledge of a word meaning develops, it becomes a psychological structure forming a "complex, multi-dimensional matrix of different cues and connections (acoustic, morphological, lexical and semantic)." Yet only a small part of a word-matrix corresponds to the denotations and connotations that can be found in dictionaries. It also includes, as Saussure suggested, an extensive system of hierarchically constructed meanings and an elaborate paradigm of related categories and lexical comparisons. Furthermore, it is linked to an array of syntagmatic patterns learned from contextual usage.

The word as a cerebral structure thus becomes, through gradual learning, immeasurably richer and more complex than any dictionary or thesaurus could possible indicate. In thought, various elements of word-matrices, including their syntagms, are brought heuristically into play prior to the articulation of an utterance. This cerebral activity, in which the historically formed and culturally transmitted facilities of the word are used to complete both the formation and formulation of meaning, is thus a critically important element in higher human cognition.[37] It gives thought its probabilistic character and provides a basis for the syntactical coherence of speech. In oral speech, the predicative syntagm, used more-or-less automatically, tends to predominate, although syntagmatic patterns can also facilitate algorithmic operations in thinking. In written speech, the logico-semantic dimensions of word-matrices can play a critically important role within the framework of a more general, cerebral system for reflective problem-solving. (Some of the differences between oral and written speech that have been described by students of language may thus have their roots in the somewhat different cerebral work involved in the articulation of various kinds of utterance. It also seems clear that, because so much of the synthesizing work of well-learned language is performed semi-automatically, problematic aspects of this work can be given conscious consideration only to the extent that appropriate methods for analyzing them have also been mastered.)

Luria also suggests that the cognitive systems of the brain have a hierarchical structure and that this structure changes in the course of ontogenetic development according to a "Law of Diminishing Specificity." In other words, as the brain of a young child matures, its relatively specific and concrete modes of sensory perception become increasingly integrated, organized, and controlled by ever more general and more abstract modes of synthesizing and analyzing impressions. The basis of the "highest" cerebral mode, according to this neurolinguist, is the sign system of natural language; and this system is already performing a dominant function by the time a child attains school age. This proposition - and the physiological evidence advanced in support of it - is, of course, quite inconsistent with the associationist

assumptions implicit in the neo-behaviourist and Piagetian psychological postulates which are currently taken for granted in the language-arts texts and which, as noted earlier, emphasize metalinguistic experience as the basis of thought almost to the exclusion of language.[38]

Two paedeutic principles can be reasonably deduced from the humanistic and neurolinguistic proposition that natural language, as it is learned, contributes to the work of all cerebral systems and forms the immediate basis of higher rational processes. One principle is that a knowledge of language can be deemed an end in itself rather than a mere instrument or vehicle for the transmission of paralinguistic information. A practical corollary of this principle is that instruction in the language-arts should foster, by whatever delightful means are most suited to the age of the child, a wide-ranging and discipline-based knowledge of words and a fertile sense of their syntagmatic and paradigmatic properties. Under the right conditions, such word-knowledge, which extends far beyond anything that can be found in a dictionary, is built up gradually but easily in the marvelously constructive human brain. This knowledge can serve both to facilitate comprehension of every kind and to enrich the potential scope of that heuristic word-play which, in composing, forms the immediate basis of inventive inquiry. Both humane philosophy and neurolinguistic physiology suggest, in fact, that such word-knowledge is an important element in cognition and the essential basis of language.

This proposition is, to be sure, inconsistent with argument that the unity of the language arts is based mainly on their use of a common phonetic or graphic code. Such codes and their systematic features are, of course, an aspect of language and should be learned well; but instruction which emphasizes the mere signality of language rather than its culturally (and historically) formed substance is of limited value. A traditional means of acquiring substantive word-knowledge is through the study of a variety of literature. This can range from poetry and fiction to scientific writing, but it will, by definition, always

consist of words used with delicate precision. For the student learning to write, the reading of literature is valuable not merely because a text uses the same linguistic "code" as is employed in writing, and still less because it can convey certain facts or instil certain "values"; its prime value lies in its power to develop the kind of word-knowledge referred to above.

A second paedeutic principle is that the practical use of language can be improved by a knowledge of principles of composition derived from a study of grammar, rhetoric and logic. Just as language, as a culturally inherited system of concepts, can strengthen an individual's natural ability to recognize, categorize, and deliberately control objects and relationships in his world, so a knowledge of the basic "metalanguages" of language can be used to improve a writer's command of the elements and structures of language itself. This principle is not incompatible with the fact that the practical use of language for either thought or communication and the analytical study of such use are distinct activities. Nor is it inconsistent with the assertion that an ability to perform the one activity does not require an ability to engage in the other. (Language can be used grammatically, logically, and effectively without a theoretical knowledge of grammar, logic, or rhetoric, just as an ability to speak a language is not essential for studying aspects of its structures.) Nevertheless, the distinctness of the two activities does not preclude the possibility of a relation between them, and there is evidence (to be discussed below) which indicates that the use of language can, under certain circumstances, be made more efficient by an analytical understanding of that use. (Similarly, the practice and theory of swimming must never be confused, although the performance of the act can sometimes be improved through an analytical study of the motions involved.) Analytical knowledge about language is, however, a <u>necessary</u> but not a <u>sufficient</u> condition for the effective application of theory to practice. Theory alone is not enough for the simple reason that the semi-automatic, synthesizing process of composing is not easily affected by analytical considerations. The effective application of theory to practice is therefore not inevitable but conditionally possible.

A quite different conclusion, it can be noted, has been reached by several of the investigators whose findings are reviewed in the section on grammar in the following chapter of this study. They have argued, on the basis of carefully designed experimental studies, that an analytical study of the structure of language, especially its grammar, has little or no effect on the actual practice of writing. They have likewise offered evidence which suggests that the frequent practice of writing does not in itself lead to improvement, even when assignments are reviewed by a student after intensive correction.[39] A more general inference drawn from this research is that the study of grammar has little or no practical value in the teaching of composition, a point which is taken more or less for granted in all of the language-arts texts under review.

What these texts do not take into consideration is the fact that certain investigators, notably Anne Obenchain in the United States and A. K. Markova and her team in the Soviet Union, have reached a contrary conclusion on the basis of equally clear and strong evidence. These two investigators, who have carried out their respective studies quite independently of each other, have demonstrated that an analytical understanding of certain, composition-related aspects of grammar, logic, and rhetoric can, in fact, be an effective means of improving writing.[40] Fortunately, there seems to be a reasonable explanation for the contradiction between the results of the research referred to above and the findings of these two investigators.

The programs of Obenchain and Markova have two distinguishing features.[41] In the first place, they outline procedures for the systematic teaching of principles of composition. These principles relate directly to the lexical, syntactical, and logical means of constructing coherent and forceful texts. Although questions of usage (which provide the main points of intersection between theory and practice in some modes of instruction) are touched on, they are treated in subordinate relation to principles of text construction. A second feature of these programs is that they make systematic use of symbolic

schemes for mediating between compositional principles and corresponding practical operations. This type of learning device typically consists of an analogical representation that can simultaneously symbolize salient features of both the abstract concept which is being applied and the concrete form of its application. The double representation, which is not unlike that of the Venn diagram used by students of logic for symbolizing syllogistic relations, enables the learner to link theory and practice at will. Such devices can also serve as focal points for self-checking procedures, which are an integral part of both programs.

In Obenchain's texts, symbolic representations (or "visual rules") are formed by a combination of letters and other graphic signs which can be easily inserted either between lines of prose or in margins. Some of these mediating devices are designed to represent linkage values in the punctuation system, in certain syntactical forms, and in various kinds of conjunctions, conjunctive adverbs, and relative pronouns. Others are constructed in order to develop a deliberate control of basic logical relations in discourse and of the linguistic devices that can be used for the management of subordination and emphasis. Still others, which consist of multi-paragraph models and symbolic notations for parts of these models, can facilitate learning about the organization of exposition and argument as well as about aspects of rhetoric and style. In Markova's program, symbolic schemes of various kinds and related self-checking procedures are employed for similar practical purposes. They are used also to teach a general "theory of the utterance" based on a systematic analysis of relationships between form and meaning, and between form and function.

Markova argues that mediating schemes and self-checking procedures are nothing more than a potentially useful means of rational "formal learning."[42] They should therefore not be confused with the "cues" of behaviourist learning-theory or with any kind of stimulus designed to elicit a thoughtless or mechanical response. The use of these subsidiary learning-devices requires, on the contrary, deliberate, reasoned reflection, which can, of course, become increasingly prognostic and

proleptic as the performance of an operation is gradually mastered. Such devices thus have a rightful, subordinate place in modes of learning that would eschew the mindlessness of behaviourist forms of training. They can also facilitate instruction that seeks to improve on the artlessness of natural cognition and the fortuitousness of personal intuition.

As the programs of Obenchain and Markova have been shown to be effective under experimental conditions,[43] they represent important advances in our understanding of the instructional means by which thought about language and the use of language can be related. Specifically, these programs demonstrate that an analytical knowledge of the structures and functions of written speech can be effectively applied to improve practical performance. Such knowledge is also necessary, of course, for the deliberate control of language--for the conscious mastery of what has been merely learned.

Both programs, it should be noted, are designed for use at the upper Intermediate level, although Obenchain's texts can also be studied with profit by untutored adults. Both facilitate the marking process inasmuch as their mediating schemes serve as specific foci for corrections and as points of reference for students; in fact, much of marking in these programs can be done by students themselves. The two programs also link the study of composition to the study of literature while recognizing the distinctness of the two activities.

Although the language-arts texts under review discuss different kinds of writing activities, they have little to say about the teaching of grammar and even less about the teaching of principles of composition that have been derived from grammar, logic, and rhetoric. Their basic assumption is that the development of writing abilities depends on ample practice, helpful comments, and personal maturation. Yet the Ontario Ministry's Curriculum Guideline for the Intermediate Division: English (1977) clearly recognizes the potential usefulness of language study in relation to writing. It suggests, in fact, that Intermediate-level students be taught aspects of grammar, rhetoric and logic in

relation to questions of usage and that more advanced students begin a systematic study of descriptive grammar in order to apply such knowledge to their written work.[44]

Recommendation

We accordingly recommend that Language Arts instructors in the Faculties of Education invite student-teachers to consider evidence which indicates (a) that systematic instruction in principles of composition can be an effective means of improving contextual, written speech and (b) that the effective linking of theory and practice may require the instructional use of mediating instruments such as symbolic schemes and self-checking procedures.

Notes

1. In secondary-level courses, students were invited to select readings from course bibliographies. Instructors kindly appended such lists to our questionnaire, and these are now on open file at Carleton University.

2. See, for example, Boyd, 24, 33; Michaelis et al, 47-50 180-82; Moffett and Wagner, 5-9, 32-36, 173-74, and chapter 22 passim; Rubin, 26-28, 80, 356; and Tiedt and Teidt, 55-57.

3. Thorn and Braun, 33.

4. Language and Thinking in the Elementary School (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970), 115-116.

5. Thought and Language, edited and translated by Eugenia Hanfmann and Gertrude Vakar (Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1962), 82-118.

6. For an analysis of remarkable similar modes of thinking and speaking among illiterate adults, see A. R. Luria Cognitive Development: Its Cultural and Social Foundations, ed. Michael Cole and trans. Martin Lopez-Morrillas (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976).

7. London: Croom Helm.

8. London: Edward Arnold, 1973.

9. London: Edward Arnold, 1975.

10. For a bibliographical survey of some recent work in this field, see Adele A. Abrahamsen, Child Language: An Interdisciplinary Guide to Theory and Research (Baltimore: University Park Press, 1977). Although this extensive, annotated bibliography lists some 1500 items, it does not include several of the humanistic and neurolinguistic studies noted in subsection iv below.

11. See, for example, Boyd, 68,77, 343; Michaelis et al, 175, 182, 187; Moffett and Wagner, 30-31, 70; Rubin 76-77, 88; Thorn and Braun, 57-58, 114-115, 208, 211; Tiedt and Tiedt, 68, 77, 343. Boyd states that speaking and writing are two interrelated expressive skills that should be taught as part of an "integrated or fused" communications program.

12. For further discussions of this point, see E. D. Hirsch, Jr., The Philosophy of Composition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), 14-32, and the works cited there. For related comments, see L. S. Vygotsky, Mind in Society (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978), 105-107; M. A. K. Halliday, Language as a Social Semiotic (London: Edward Arnold, 1978), 205-211; and H. A. Gleason, Jr., An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics (New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, 1965), 108-111.

13. See James Britton, Language and Learning (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970) and James Britton et al, The Development of Writing Abilities 11-18 (London: MacMillan Education, 1975); James Moffett, Teaching the Universe of Discourse (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968).

14. 'Learning to Write, or Writing to Learn?':A critical analysis and evaluation of the Schools Council Project of written language of 11- to 18-year-olds and its development project, 'Writing across the Curriculum' (Windsor, Berks.: NFER Publishing, 1977).

15. Learning How to Mean: Explorations in the Development of Language (London: Edward Arnold, 1975), 37-59.

16. Explorations in the Functions of Language (London: Edward Arnold, 1973), 19; Lanugage and Social Man (London: Longman for the Schools Council, 1974), 27-31. See also M. A. K. Halliday Language as a Social Semiotic (London: Edward Arnold, 1978), 30-31, 57.

17. A. K. Markova, The Teaching and Mastery of Language, ed. Beatrice Beach Szekely with a Forward by Michael Cole, trans. Michel Vale (White Plains, New York: M. E. Sharpe, 1979), 27. This translation of a 1974 Russian text appeared simultaneously in Soviet Education: A Journal of Translations, 21, Nos. 2-3-4 (December-January-February, 1978-79). It discusses the findings of a twelve-member research collective who observed the teaching of an experimental, intermediate-level syllabus. For further discussion of this work, which was received too late to be included in our survey of research abroad, see section iv below.

18. Patrick Groff, "Children's Oral Language and Their Written Composition," The Elementary School Journal, 78, No.3 (1978), 180-191.

19. Moffett and Wagner, 443. See also Boyd, 102; Michaelis et al, 177, 185-86; Rubin, 168; Tiedt and Tiedt, 51, 354-55; Thorn and Braun, 39, 258, 394.

20. The Teacher's Word Book of 30,000 Words (New York: Columbia University Teachers College, 1944).

21. Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Fourth Edition, (London: MacMillan, 1969), 1282-1299. For a comparative discussion of curricular aims with respect to vocabulary enlargement, see Arthur S. Trace, What Ivan Knows that Johnny Doesn't (New York: Random House, 1961). The Soviet language and reading curriculum is apparently designed to acquaint children with some 10,000 words by the end of their fifth grade. The comparable figure for U.S. curricula is about 4,000 words, an objective that is consistent with the advice given in several of the language-arts texts under discussion.

22. See Irving Lorge and Jeanne Chall, "Estimating the size of vocabularies of children and adults: an analysis of methodological

issues," The Journal of Experimental Education, 32, No.2 (Winter, 1963), 147-158.

23. Literary Lapses (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1957), 141-46.

24. For a disturbing discussion of the recently increasing inability of American students at both elementary and secondary levels to comprehend the non-technical language used in text-books and in the verbal Standard Achievement tests, see Jeanne Chall, An Analysis of Textbooks in Relation to Declining SAT Scores (Washington: ETS, 1977).

25. For a bibliographical study of this subject, see Edgar Dale et al., Bibliography of Vocabulary Studies (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1973). For two suggestive discussions, see Walter T. Petty et al., The State of Knowledge about the Teaching of Vocabulary (NCTE, 1968) and Joseph Patrick O'Rourke, Toward a Science of Vocabulary Development (The Hague: Mouton, 1974).

26. See, for example, Boyd, 6-7; Michaelis et al, 175-77, 185; Moffett and Wagner, 9-11; Rubin, 5; Tiedt and Tiedt, 5-6, 170; Thorn and Braun, 1, 27, 47, 52.

27. For concise statements of this theory, see Noam Chomsky, "Recent Contributions to the Theory of Innate Ideas," Synthèse, 17 (1967), 2-11, and "The formal nature of language" in Eric H. Lenneberg, Biological Foundations of Language (New York: Wiley, 1967), 397-442.

28. D. O. Hebb et al, "Language, Thought and Experience," Modern Language Journal, 55 (1971), 212-222; A. R. Luria, "Scientific perspectives and philosophical dead ends in modern linguistics," Cognition, 3, No.4 (1974), 355-385; and Jerome S. Bruner, "The ontogenesis of speech acts," Journal of Child Language, 2 (1975), 1-19.

29. For two recent humanist critiques of neo-behaviourist communications theory, see George Steiner, After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation (London: Oxford University Press, 1975) and Ian Robinson, The New Grammarians' Funeral: A Critique of Noam Chomsky's Linguistics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975). Both these books, which still await responses that squarely address their main arguments, include discussions of the role of language in cognition and critical analyses of the evidence advanced for certain "linguistic universals" taken for granted by behaviourist and neo-rationalist notions of language. For other humanist statements on these questions, see Joseph Gold, ed., In The Name of Language! (Toronto: MacMillan, 1975); Ann E. Berthoff, "From Problem-Solving to a Theory of the Imagination," College English 33 (March, 1972), 636-649; and I. A. Richards, So Much Nearer; essays toward a world English (New York: Harcourt Brace and World, 1968), Ch. iv.

30. Ed. Rudolf Engler (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1968).

31. For further discussion of this question, see Engler, "European Structuralism: Saussure" in Current Trends in Linguistics, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok, Volume XIII (The Hague: Mouton, 1975), 835, note 12.

32. For surveys of post-Saussurian work, see E. F. K. Koerner, Ferdinand de Saussure: Origin and Development of his Linguistic Thought in Western Studies of Language (Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1973) and Rudolf Engler, "European Structuralism: Saussure" in Current Trends in Linguistics, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok, Volume XIII (The Hague: Mouton, 1975), 829-886. Neither of these reviews discusses relevant Soviet work, which has accepted several of Saussure's postulates and systematically studied lexicography, syntagmatics, and paradigmatics. For a discussion of the implications of some of this work, see Anna Ufimtseva, "Problems of Meaning in the Study of the Sign Aspect of the Language" in Theoretical Aspects of Linguistics (Moscow: USSR Academy of Sciences, 1977), 114-124.

33. Ufimtseva, 115-120.

34. For a modern, introductory analysis of these traditional properties of a term, see Monroe C. Beardsley, Thinking Straight: Principles of Reasoning for Readers and Writers, 4th ed. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1975), Ch. v.

35. Karl H. Pribram, Languages of the Brain: Experimental Paradoxes and Principles in Neuropsychology (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971).

36. A. R. Luria, The Working Brain: An Introduction to Neuropsychology (New York: Basic Books, 1973), Ch. xiii.

37. For Luria's discussion of this matter, see Basic Problems of Neurolinguistics, (The Hague: Mouton, 1975), Ch. i; The Working Brain, Chs. xii and xiii, and Speech and the Development of Mental Processes in the Child, rev. ed. (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971), Ch. i. See also Jeremy M. Anglin, Word, Object, and Conceptual Development (New York: Norton, 1977) for a pertinent behavioural study of the development of certain meaning aspects of word knowledge.

38. One text, it is true, asserts that cognition is organized through hierarchical abstracting and that there is a close connection between levels of psychological abstraction and modes of discourse (Moffett and Wagner, 456-57). But this text describes the abstracting process in dualistic, communications-model terms. The "nervous system" is said to transform intuitively "raw material" into "information," and the completion of this operation is designated a "prerequisite" for abstracting consciously with language. This explanation is incompatible with Luria's argument that language in the form of word-meanings is a basic element in all abstracting.

39. J. Stephen Sherwin, Four Problems in Teaching English: A Critique of Research, published for the National Council of Teachers of English (Scranton, Pennsylvania, 1969), 156-167. A notable exception to this generalization is the practice of sentence-combining, an activity that results in the writing of longer and more complex sentences. For a discussion of mere length and complexity, however, as criteria for measuring "maturity" in writing, see the section of grammar and rhetoric in the following chapter of this Study.

40. Anne Obenchain, "Developing Paragraph Power through Sentence-Combining," in Sentence Combining and the Teaching of Writing: Selected Papers from the Miami University Conference, Oxford, Ohio, October 27 and 28, 1978, ed. Donald A. Daiker et al, Studies in Contemporary Language No. 3 (Conway, Arkansas: L & S Books, 1979), 123-133. See also the full text of this paper (available from Validated Writing Systems, 2043 Durand Drive, Reston, Va. 22091). An unpublished M.A. thesis by Obenchain, "Effectiveness of the Precise Essay Question in Programming the Sequential Development of Written Composition Skills and the Simultaneous Development of Critical Reading Skills" (George Washington University, 1971), is also relevant. A copy of this thesis is held by the Library at Carleton University. For an account of A. K. Markova's experimental findings, see her monograph, The Teaching and Mastery of Language, ed. Beatrice Beach Szekely (White Plains, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe, Inc., 1979), 137-231.

41. Obenchain's texts are Links to Forceful Writing, Part One: Sentence Power (1971), Links to Forceful Writing, Part Two: Paragraph and Multi-Paragraph Power (1971), and an instructor's manual for each of these texts--all published by Validated Writing Systems, 2043 Durand Drive, Reston, Virginia, 22091. For a description of Markova's course of study, see The Teaching and Mastery of Language, 47-93, 237-268.

42. For Markova's discussion of this important point, see The Teaching and Mastery of Language, 93-134. Markova's comments on mediating schemes are based in part on the learning theories of D. B. El'konin, V. V. Davydov, and Jerome S. Bruner.

43. See note 40 above.

44. See especially pp. 56-8.

CHAPTER 2

A SURVEY OF SOME WORK ON TEACHING COMPOSITION

by

Trevor Banks and James Steele

INTRODUCTION

This chapter is a survey of some books and articles on procedures for teaching composition. Unlike other parts of this report, this chapter was initially drafted by one member of the team and then later expanded by a second. It thus reflects the judgement of two reviewers, the first drafter being a secondary-school teacher of English who has had extensive experience in teaching composition from grades 6 to 13 in the United Kingdom, Manitoba, British Columbia, and Ontario. The purpose of the survey is not to evaluate either work on methods of teaching composition or the methods themselves. Rather, it is to provide an inventory of some of the instructional techniques that have been suggested by teachers and theorists in their published work. Discussion of a particular procedure does not therefore imply commendation of it.

This survey is limited in scope to items that have a direct practical application to the teaching of composition, more especially the teaching of expository writing from grades 7 to 13. For an extensive review of work on the teaching of composition at more advanced levels, the reader can consult the excellent bibliographical studies in Teaching Composition: 10

Bibliographical Essays edited by Gary Tate. Furthermore, only some North American material and a handful of British texts have been taken into consideration. It should also be noted that certain parts of this chapter, such as those dealing with grammar and rhetoric, do not purport to represent the present state of knowledge in particular disciplines. Most of the material in these parts refers, in fact, not to texts on grammar and rhetoric but to certain books and articles on the teaching of composition that have identified aspects of these disciplines as having specific relevance to the teaching of writing.

This chapter is divided into six sections. The first three, which are entitled respectively "Prewriting," "Writing", and "Revising," take note of instructional techniques for particular phases of composition. The fourth section describes a variety of procedures for teaching certain aspects of composition in a classroom situation; the fifth takes note of some applications of grammar and rhetoric to the teaching of writing. The sixth section surveys ways of responding effectively to the written work of students.

All texts referred to in this chapter are listed alphabetically by author or editor at the end of the chapter. Each item on this list is also cited in the main Bibliography of this Report, which gives more detailed bibliographical information. Unless otherwise indicated, these entries in the main Bibliography are in the sections headed "American Monographs, Reports and Papers" or "American Periodical Articles and Articles

from Encyclopaedia." In the sections below, authors and editors are cited by surname with initials or Christian names added only when necessary to distinguish one author from another of the same name. Titles are included only if the review deals with more than one text by an author. A parenthetical "see" reference indicates the name of the editor or journal under which an essay or article can be found in the main Bibliography.

SECTION I

PREWRITING

Assignments

Tate and Corbett in Teaching High School Composition provide a bibliography on assignments and include six useful essays on various aspects of this topic.

Many theorists have addressed the problem of ill-conceived assignments. Mellon, for example, says in National Assessment and the Teaching of English that weakness in the art of making good assignments can lead to serious problems in evaluation of the finished product. Farrell, in "The Beginning Begets: Making Composition Assignments" (see Graves), advises the teacher to avoid making assignments that may lead either to short fragmentary responses or to idle speculation. Also to be avoided are those that are vaguely expressed or assume knowledge that a student does not have. Assignments that provoke incoherency by posing numerous questions or that pit a novice against a professional are likewise inappropriate. A problem with many of these kinds of assignments, says Farrell, is that there is no stipulated audience and purpose "which would help a student to define himself in context ... [and] adopt an appropriate persona." Students, in other words, must be led to role-play, and Farrell describes four kinds of assignments which would be conducive to this end by virtue of their "built-in 'selves'."

Farrell's concern that assignments should have a definite

purpose and audience is pertinent to the question of the "realness" of writing assignments. Simon, Hawley and Britton aver that writing should be the sending of written messages one cares to send to a receiver one hopes to influence. Traditional composition assignments, they claim, violate this concept in many ways. Barr suggests that assignments be directed to a specific and significant audience. Students should thus be required to match what they have to say with how best to say it. She gives a list of realistic assignments which includes various kinds of letters, advertisements, news stories and eulogies. Logan, Logan and Paterson, referring specifically to the elementary-school level, also suggest such realistic writing activities as the composing of reports, records, announcements, labels, notices, book reviews and biographies. To this list could be added the writing of favourite recipes, rules for school games, and accurate street directions for taking a student home from school in an emergency.

Assignments which reinforce lessons in language are discussed in Raybin's "Language-Oriented Composition Assignments" (see Arizona English Bulletin v. 15). Although many theorists on this topic concern themselves with elements of grammar, the writer of this article concentrates on such aspects of language as abstraction, metaphor, connotation, and tone. He goes on to suggest angles from which such "language-oriented" compositions can be approached.

In a section of Teaching English Today called "Eight

Hallmarks of a Good Composition Assignment," Burton et al. insist that assignments should excite and challenge students to say something that matters to both author and reader. Furthermore, assignments should be related to ideas and materials being used at the time and to the knowledge and experience of the students. The good assignment will of itself lead students to look for a purpose and an appropriate audience, voice, and style. It will often focus on one writing skill yet allow students to experiment and play with language. Finally, Burton et al. recommend that the teacher write the assignment himself first. In "Methods to Motivate Composition Students" (see Clapp), McIntyre presents a condensed version of a list of questions formulatd by Tierney and Judy for assessing the criteria for a good writing assignment. These criteria are divided into two categories: one, which pertains to the relation between assignment and writer, is subdivided into motivation and stimulation, appropriateness, open-endedness, and language play; the other, which is concerned with the writer and his audience, is subdivided into the writer's function and voice, his readers and their reactions. In an article called "The Assignment Makers," Tierney and Judy suggest how topics for writing can grow from artifacts brought to school by students, from the use of posters and from current problems and crises being faced by students. Caruso and Weidenborner discuss finding topics in a non-literature course.

On the question of whether the teacher or the student should provide the topics and assignments in composition lessons, Brown,

Gallagher and Turner point out some of the problems that may arise from giving students a free choice of subjects. They suggest that the English teacher is not usually competent to judge, or help with, content from fields other than English and consequently cannot evaluate the paper as a whole. Furthermore, some students may continually write on more or less the same subjects because of limited knowledge and interests, thus restricting their thinking and personal growth. The authors suggest that most good topics arise from the subject matter of literature or the study of language, and that they should be set by the teacher. (The answer to this question will perhaps depend on the precise circumstances in which the assignment is to be made. In any case, it could be argued that there are advantages to both methods. For example, if the teacher assigns a topic, all students can be engaged in writing on the same subject. This facilitates class discussions - an important preliminary to the actual writing procedure - by providing an opportunity for gathering and clarifying relevant data. In addition, as a follow-up to the actual writing, students can sometimes derive further benefit from a discussion of various samples of finished compositions on a common topic. On the other hand, when students are asked to select their own topics, either of their own devising or from a list of suggestions from which they can choose, they have the advantage of writing on something that they have personal knowledge of and interest in. In such cases, the opportunity to make the assignment real in the sense discussed above may present

itself more easily.)

Gehle and Rollo discuss the what, why, how, and for whom of topic selection, with exercises, examples, questions, and annotations. Murray suggests how writers can find something to write about by using their senses, by observing relationships, by reading and listening and by being honest, curious, and sceptical. Barr recommends the use of "jackdaws" not only for topics but also for motivation and content. Rogal says that topics should come from the student's direct experience, from information gained from different academic subjects, and from "personal opinions based on the influence of the ideas of others." He includes a list of such topics, many of which, unfortunately, do not satisfy Rogal's own criteria.

Talking Before Writing

Much speculative literature on the developmental relationship between speech and writing in the linguistic maturation of the child falls outside the scope of this review.

Many teachers of composition agree that, wherever possible, a writing assignment should be preceded by talking about the subject. Whitehead, while stressing the importance of oral preparation for writing, warns that it should not be used invariably. Much depends, he says, on the topic and on the ability and temperament of the class and its stage of development. Nevertheless, discussion can perhaps be regarded as the most important single aspect of prewriting activity.

Kelly (see Ohmann and Coley) points out that the talking should be done mainly by the students and that the teacher"must learn to shut up." He maintains that people learn to write better by talking. Students should be asked to share their own knowledge, skills, ideas and feelings with the teacher and the class. They should be asked to "talk on paper" in their own everyday language. No subjects needing analysis and extensive reading should be assigned until students are able to talk freely and easily in groups. The teacher is merely a participating member of a group. Students start with informal chatting and later move on to various "tasks."

Gurrey, however, in The Teaching of Written English, argues that a well-conducted preparatory discussion should generate activity of mind, an abundance of ideas, and principles of organization. Through adroit preparatory questioning, a teacher can "give a training in how to set about composing, and especially in finding profitable and significant ways of apprehending a subject: not merely thinking about it (that is the initial step), and not merely in thinking round the subject (that is only the second step); but in holding in mind the complete material that has been compiled ready for writing."

Crabbe claims success with a prewriting exercise derived from debating. Although designed for use at the freshman-English level, the exercise could probably be adapted for secondary school. Students in pairs take opposite sides on a question and, after reading about it in newspapers and magazines, meet to

discuss it. Each then writes his case in a 500 word essay while bearing in mind the prior discussion "as a guide to probable points of difficulty in his audience's understanding of his argument." Crabbe claims that students who write in this way have a point of view that actually exists, arguments to support their ideas, a clear idea of audience and the relevant vocabulary. Such papers are characterized by "honest thinking" and "a sense of immediacy and involvement."

Golub and Reising suggest several oral exercises that "'flow' into other forms of communication." Such activities include reading aloud, discussing what has been read and then writing about it. More specifically, the authors claim that good oral reading of poems, stories and plays depends on a thorough understanding of the material and that this insight can lead to probing discussions and to written work which clarifies and crystalizes students' ideas. Discussion can take the form of "brainstorming," in which the main points on a given topic are gathered from the class and written on the blackboard by the teacher for evaluation and possible shaping into outlines. The authors point out that this is an integrated approach combining speaking, reading, and writing. Clapp uses tape recordings of class discusions to make students self-critical of their discussion of a literary work and aware of the need for precision, coherence, organization.

Motivation

It is doubtful whether motivation can usefully be regarded

as a discrete aspect of the total field of prewriting didactics. Almost all of the ideas discussed in this prewriting section have some bearing on motivating students to write. One aspect, already touched on under "Assignments," is the "realness" of the assignment. Petty, Petty and Becking claim that motivation is not a problem if the writing task has an immediate purpose and grows out of an activity or experience which has shown that communication through writing is needed. Likewise Judy, in Explorations in the Teaching of Secondary English, suggests that teachers should stop using grades for justifying assignments and motivating students but should instead give students choices of activities - Judy calls these "gambits" - which generate language. (It might be noted parenthetically here that much writing by students cannot be regarded as simple communication in which the writer has some knowledge to convey to a reader who is without that knowledge, or in which the writer wishes to affect his reader in some specific way toward which end he can marshall the resources of rhetoric available to him. In the context of the classroom, writing is frequently a rather artificial procedure in which the student must write on a subject already well known to the reader (the teacher) in order to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of some academic matter. Rightly or wrongly, writing does serve this very special evaluative function in the education systems. It should be evident, therefore, that the criterion of "realness" can be applied only with some considerable distortion to a large proportion of exposition writing assignments

undertaken at the secondary school level and beyond.)

Activities preliminary to the actual writing can of course serve an important motivational purpose. In "Junior High School Foundations for Expository Composition" (see Los Angeles City Schools), the author suggests a number of promising writing activities to be engaged in prior to expository writing. "English for Young School Leavers," from The Centre for Information on the Teachingof English in Edinburgh, contains suggestions for using such stimuli as readings, recorded songs and cartoons, followed by questions, discussion and other oral activities. Most people are somewhat inhibited by the very act of taking a pen in hand, and Stewart's "Composition, Culture, Citizenship" contains suggestions about ways of breaking down inhibitions against writing by having students experiment with language which is fresh, lively and workable. His technique includes consideration of abstractions and clichés and the use of graffiti-boards, bumper-stickers, signs, comic-strips, and other media.

Whenever teachers can connect writing to the personal needs and interests of their students, awaken their intellectual curiosity, or enable them to explore their own feelings, strong motivation can be assumed. Loban, Ryan and Squire present an elaborate plan of prewriting activities to serve each of these ends. Hawley and Hawley supply nutritional food for thought on the subject of motivation in two lists headed "What makes writing fun?" and "What makes writing not fun?" Brown, Gallagher and Turner shrewdly point out that students often write better about

areas of their own special interest than about their own experience.

In "Methods to Motivate Composition Students," McIntyre (see Clapp) presents a number of ideas based on key concepts in the programs of several well-known English educators. According to Redd, the best basis for motivation is relevance". She says that a hidden reservoir of interests and experiences must be tapped and students' sensitivity to the world around them developed. Evaluating by grading may motivate some students but can destroy the creativity of others. Daniel Fader's concept of "Diffusion" is also suggested by McIntyre as a motivating device. The "Diffusion" program consists of two types of exercises: 1) work which may be read only by the student-author and 2) a journal which the teacher may read but only with the student's permission. Both kinds of assignment are made on the assumption that one can learn to write by writing in volume. Fader also suggests having students copy the writing of others. McIntyre warns that Fader's approach is designed basically for students who, faced with traditional approaches, would not write. Two other motivational devices outlined by McIntyre are the use of television commercials and films.

Finally, the teacher's attitude to his students and their writing is a vital component of motivation. Murray suggests that one should praise as much as possible while maintaining standards, take an interest in the student as a person, and listen with careful concern to what a student has to say.

Invention

Ever since Aristotle devised his famous "topics," teachers of composition have been concerned with "invention" or the discovery of arguments. A useful survey of classical theory on this subject may be found in Corbett's Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student, which also includes a part of Larson's helpful essay "Discovery Through Questioning: A Plan for Teaching Rhetorical Invention." A shorter introduction to the "invention" of classical rhetoric may be found in D'Angelo's "New and Renewed Rhetorics." Winterowd, in his "'Topics' and Levels in the Composing Process" (see Ohmann and Coley), summarizes much of the current theory on the subject. He argues that "invention" is central to the composing process and that "topics" provide the best devices to facilitate invention. He regards topics, in fact, as heuristic devices for problem-solving: they provide a series of questions or operations that guide enquiry and increase the chances of finding workable solutions. More simply, these questions enable a writer to discover things to say about a subject. Winterowd discusses briefly such heuristic procedures as Becker's TRI (topic, restriction, illustration), PS (problem, solution), QA (question, answer) schema; Pike's "nine item finite set of content-oriented topics"; and Burke's Pentad.

The heuristics of Becker, Pike and Burke are also discussed in "What Can I Say About My Subject?" (see Los Angeles City Schools) and by D'Angelo, who draws on many of the ideas in Young, Becker and Pike's Rhetoric: Discovery and Change. In

"Writing As a Way of Knowing," McCrimmon (see Graves) touches briefly on Pike's trimodal analysis of discourse into particle, wave, and field. Catherine E. Lamb presents four categories of invention (systematic and unsystematic discovery by a group, and systematic and unsystematic discovery by an individual) and includes a selected bibliography on the teaching of invention. In Explorations in the Teaching of Secondary English, Judy provides a list of questions that can help students write on autobiographical topics.

Barnet and Stubbs give advice on how a student can write on a large subject by concentrating on an aspect of it which interests him or about which he has some knowledge. Further advice is offered on how one can write effectively about a personal experience even though it may have been unremarkable or even boring; samples of such writing are included.

On the subject of restricting and expanding essay topics, Caruso and Weidenborner have some provocative ideas. They suggest a means of restricting and developing a topic at an appropriate level of specificity, illustrating the concept with a diagram showing the range of specificity for the general subject "animals". They also show how to turn an outline for a short paper into a long paper on the same topic.

Observation

The art of careful, accurate, perceptive observation is of vital importance to the writing act. Observation may precede the

choosing of a topic, or it may be engaged in afterwards to derive specific material with which to build the composition. Or it may be helpful in restricting a general topic to a more specific one. Whatever its use, the writer's powers of observation must be sharpened if he is to be a skilful practitioner of his craft.

According to Rollo Brown, the young French boy was not expected to write an organized composition without assistance. At ages ten to thirteen he was given exercises requiring accurate observation, such tasks as the oral or written reproduction of passages that had been read aloud and explained by a teacher, or the descriptions of simple objects using information derived from all five senses. Loban, Ryan and Squire suggest some strategies for extending and sharpening observation. Elcan recommends describing details and focusing on words with a sensory appeal. She includes exercises, readings for analysis, and writing assignments. Graves says that stress should be placed on observation and on inferences from observation so that the writer gains a detailed knowledge of the subject. Some of the most helpful advice on the art of observation is Murray's explanation of how the writer sees, or discovers, a subject. He lists "the writer's 21 senses" - the traditional five together with some sixteen senses of judgement - and explains their powers of invention.

Detailed Prewriting Procedures

Several theorists present detailed prewriting procedures.

Such methods, of course, are consistent with an approach to writing that stresses the importance of preliminary planning. Crews gives detailed instructions for getting started, moving from subject area to topic, finding a thesis, taking notes, and writing exploratory drafts. Albert says there are four activities basic to the writing process: ideation (thinking about what is to be written); immersion (building a file of materials and thoughts on a particular subject); incubation (allowing the subconscious to supply ideas on the topic to be written about); and interaction (exchanging ideas and drafts with other students). Goodenough's four-hour course for teaching university students how to compose efficiently through topic analysis and peer criticism would probably be suitable for students at the grade 12 or 13 level.

McCrimmon (see Graves) describes a procedure in which the teacher and students discuss the potential content of the writing assignment. The teacher provides the subject and the students suggest relevant materials. These are clarified by discussion and made more specific in order to facilitate selection according to the purpose of writing. The teacher writes this data on the blackboard, and the students choose their own view of the subject and an appropriate theme for development in a composition. McCrimmon suggests, however, that not all prewriting needs to be written up. As well as making fewer demands on the teacher, the student who engages in prewriting activities gets practice thinking about a subject. McCrimmon also advises against forcing

the pace of writing. Writing is the expression of a unique individual, and general prescriptions often do not work.

Rollo Brown, in his section on preparation of material, says that in the French classroom a subject was analyzed in class with all students writing on the same topic. The students used free association to collect ideas, and teacher and students questioned each other about the subject. Brown says that with a class aged from 10 to 12 the teacher worked out a fairly definite plan for the composition.

Kinneavy, Cope and Campbell give a detailed account of exploring a problem. They say that such activity is usually disorganized by uncertainty. Most exploration, they say, is done for oneself. Anything that bothers one, anything that is neither totally certain nor totally unknown to one may be explored. The logical and psychological stages of exploring a problem are set out in detail.

McCrimmon says that right choices about content and organization will be made by the writer who clearly sees his purpose. Purpose is defined as "your awareness ... of what you want to do, and how in general you want to do it." McCrimmon discusses getting and using details. We observe, we interpret, we draw conclusions, we make judgments. Interpretation is giving significance to our observations by fitting them into a pattern, thus giving observations new meaning. He suggests a method for observing and interpreting and for making inferences, conclusions and judgments from observations. He says that purpose controls

our search for, and selection of, material derived from thinking about our experiences. McCrimmon sets out some of the common patterns of organization, including illustration, comparison, contrast and classification.

Commers (see Geuder et al.) details a structured prewriting technique for use while studying a literary work. The example she gives involves first passing out to the class 40 topic sentences based on the first act of a play being studied. The students collect evidence supporting or negating their topic sentences, and the teacher helps those whose evidence is inadequate. The advantage of this procedure is said to be that the students accumulate plenty of evidence, which facilitates selection and organization of the most important details. In studying a five-act play the teacher works five times with each student in this prewriting stage. It seems, however, that this system would work only with the very simplest and most easily supported topic sentences.

Frey (see Geuder et al.) strongly maintains that the formal pre-structuring of compositions by teacher and class is an indispensable element in the practice of writing in school. He claims that the "post-mortem alone" is an ineffective way to teach composition. The teacher must introduce the writing activity by motivating students and by giving detailed instruction on the assignment. He should use the blackboard and overhead projector to set down ideas. These ideas should be obtained largely from student discussion in which the thinking and composing processes

begin. The assignment having been broken down into steps, the class should be allowed to suggest various approaches. The teacher should show how to introduce and organize a composition, remaining in close contact with the students as they are in the process of writing. They should show him their introductory paragraphs and other parts of the composition for discussion. Criteria for evaluation should be established. The post-mortem can be used to reinforce elements stressed in the assignment.

Similarly, Hipple, in Teaching English in Secondary Schools, places the "focus ... on the instruction in composition which [precedes] ... the ... writing." He places great emphasis on a teacher-guided prewriting discussion that includes matters of substance and organization.

Stewart, in "Composition, Culture, Citizenship," strikes a balance between spontaneous and pre-structured writing in advocating that students should get practice in both "experimental" and "focused" writing. In the former, students write freely as much as they like about what they like, and they do so fearless of failure and certain of some reward. These writings are like rough drafts rather than finished products. "Focused" writing is more disciplined; students becoming gradually exposed to some negative criticism from their peers rather than from the teacher.

Murray also advocates a compromise between freedom and structure. He divides the prewriting process into four stages: discovering the subject, sensing the audience, searching for

specifics, and creating a design. He says the writer must know where he is going but should use his own design which only he needs to be able to see. Writing is a flexible process not a rigid procedure. As the writer rediscovers his subject and gets to know his audience better, he must be prepared to change or scrap anything that does not work. The student must therefore write from an abundance of ideas, so that he has plenty of material to choose from. Murray suggests sources of invention and illustrates how exact details rather than vague generalities lead to more effective writing. The leading sentence, says Murray, is most important. It should capture the audience. It takes most of the writer's effort as it limits the subject, gives a direction and tone, and establishes control over the subject. Once it has been clearly formulated, the writing of the first draft can be rapid. Murray believes students should use précis techniques to analyze the structures of various samples of writing. They can then consider incorporating such patterns into their own writing. He gives examples of paragraphs using different designs and suggests four ways of developing an essay.

Outlining

Outlining is another preliminary to writing about which there has been some debate. Many composition textbooks used both at secondary schools and at universities set out the traditional methods of outlining: a thesis statement, followed by major headings, which are likewise subdivided, each subdivision

containing, in point form, a list of supporting data, all carefully arranged with appropriate indentations and Roman and Arabic numerals. Few composition assignments, however, actually lend themselves to such preconceived, inflexible designs. Allen says, in the Final Report of the Minesota Colleges Conference on English Teacher Preparation, that the real processes of writing should be examined and taught in school, not the artificial, prestructured outline. Unfortunately, he gives no further information as to how this can best be done. Judy (see Graves) argues strongly against the outline. He says that outlines are suitable only for topics that can be split into 'aspects' or equally weighted parts. Many topics, however, are not parallel but subordinate to each other. These require "statements developing from and modifying previous ones while simultaneously preparing the reader for more complex, more detailed generalizations."

Crews discusses outlining with qualified approval. He mentions common criticisms made by students. Some say they never use an outline but abstract a required outline from the completed composition. Others note that, if they do use an outline, it gets radically altered as the writing develops. Crews argues that "an imperfect guide is always better than none." Having to alter an outline while writing shows that "planning an essay is a continuing business." But, Crews warns, if students use outlines inflexibly, they "will get a false sense of control over unmastered problems."

McCrimmon advocates a more structured approach. He advises students at the preliminary stage of writing an essay first to jot down, in brief, ideas suggested by the question or topic. The student should then make a thesis statement to control the shape of the essay and finally make an outline by eliminating ideas irrelevant to the thesis and arranging the relevant ones in effective order. He warns against making the outline before formulating the thesis statement.

The Writer's Audience

Piagetian pedagogy together with the recent revival and modification of classical rhetoric seems to have been the main source of a renewed interest in the question of audience. It is probably true, however, that in many English classrooms today most student writing is addressed to, and may be read exclusively by, a single reader - the teacher. Whatever advantages writing for this limited audience may have, it has been suggested that the student will thereby learn little about writing for many other types of reader. The problem of finding varied readerships for students' writing must be faced by any teacher who wishes to make his composition lessons a means of developing versatile writers. The question of audience is also of critical importance in designing tasks in which students are motivated by seeing a real purpose for the exposition they are asked to write.

Judy, in Explorations in the Teaching of Secondary English, says the teacher should make a list of ways in which he can help

his students find readerships, giving as examples the school or classroom newspaper, writing contests and bulletin boards. Loban, Ryan and Squire suggest the following activities: corresponding with youth abroad (they include some addresses); sending letters to age-mates; keeping class minutes; writing for publication in letters to editors or in class news-sheets; writing for other courses; writing self-evaluations; and writing letters of appreciation to authors, illustrators and others. Berlin and Miller in "Help! I'm a Prisoner in a Letter Factory!" (see Clapp), describe a pen-pal project done in stages. In the same volume, Hollowell, in "Magazine Writers in Junior High: The Publishing Game," describes a simulation game which "mirrors the real-world process of writing and editing a small magazine."

Once a readership has been found, the need arises for the writer to appraise this audience so that he may most effectively achieve the purpose for which he is writing. Gehle and Rollo discuss audience evaluation in relation to questions of knowledge, style and language. McCrimmon says that an understanding of audience affects the choice of subject, tone, and organization. It also helps the writer to decide on his purpose.

In a section called "Sensing the Audience," Murray says that the writer should not look up to or down on the reader; he must know what the reader knows, does not know, needs to know, and wants to know. He adds that if the writer finds himself through his writing he will find his audience, because "all of us have some common core." The writer then should not change his truths

to fit the reader, but should develop them in terms that the reader can understand. Students, says Murray, need to write for different audiences. He suggests, for example, asking students to write a paragraph as it would appear in a newspaper, a TV news program, a school paper, The Atlantic Monthly, and a note to the class. Murray also suggests that the English teacher might offer to serve as audience for writing done in other courses. Papers in history, for example, might be discussed in a writing course. Similarly, Murray believes that students should act as audience for work written by their classmates and that they should edit work of students in classes other than their own.

Kinneavy, Cope and Campbell make some generalizations about a typical audience. They claim that, as a rule, a reader is relatively ignorant of the information to be presented yet may be interested in the subject. He has confidence in the writer and primarily needs simple, straightforward knowledge. They also point out that it is a common fallacy to believe that all writing dealing with opinions is designed to make others agree. The self-expressive writer, for instance, has a take-it-or-leave-it attitude toward his readers; he does not care to convince them.

Persuasion and the Audience

A most important reason for analysing an audience is the need for the writer on occasion to persuade his reader to accept his opinion or to take some action on an issue. Kinneavy, Cope and Campbell give three samples of persuasive writing followed by

a discussion of both the pragmatics and the ethics of persuasion, the latter topic being an aspect of writing too often ignored by rhetoricians. Kinneavy, Cope and Campbell stress the writer's need to know his audience in order to judge what language and subject matter are likely to be emotionally acceptable and persuasive to that audience. They break down the technique of persuasion into four models of appeal: 1) appeals by emotion; 2) appeals by personality; 3) appeals by style; and 4) appeals by subject matter. The writer should try to convince the reader through reason and should use only enough evidence and reasoning as necessary, not attempting to make a comprehensive, unassailable case as in scientific exposition. Exercises are included.

In his discussion of persuasion, McCrimmon shows how the writer tries to change the reader's "image," that is, to alter the view or set of beliefs the reader has learned to accept. McCrimmon recommends that the writer fit the persuasion to the audience by having a specific reader in mind, by identifying with his reader to establish an area of agreement, and by focusing on what is important to both himself and his reader. He should then provide the evidence the reader needs in order to accept his beliefs, and make his paper as easy to read as possible. Emotional appeal, McCrimmon says, is sometimes necessary to produce action; and the strongest form of emotional appeal is the dramatic example. Winterowd, however, referring specifically to persuasive writing, claims that most written arguments are not addressed to one person or even to a well-defined group. The

writer must therefore ask what he can expect "all reasonable people" to know and accept.

The "Authentic Voice" Approach

A philosophy of composition that has had far-reaching effects describes ways of finding an "authentic voice" for writing. Stewart, in The Authentic Voice, is the major proponent, and his declared purpose is to enable a writer to achieve self-discovery through writing. He claims that logical consistency as well as clarity of thought and expression will develop "naturally" as the writer "come[s] to terms" with himself and his abilities. An authentic voice is best developed through a pre-writing progression of inception, concept formation, and composition (i.e. organizing the concepts). Chapter 1, "The Writer's Attitude", advises the student how to think and act as a writer. He should start by proposing topics or modifying teacher-proposed assignments and then learn to perceive in a manner unique to himself. Success will depend on his natural curiosity, concentration, and honesty.

Chapter 2, "The Seeing Eye", is concerned with ways of increasing the intensity and quantity of the writer's perceptions of things around him. The procedures suggested for achieving this end include the following: simulating the loss of various senses; trying to look at experience through another's eyes (role-playing); and relinquishing temporarily some prejudices and stereotypes in order to become more sensitive.

Chapter 4, "Conquering the World of Abstractions," deals with concept formation. The writer is told how to test the validity of concepts, which are usually products of induction. Stewart also discussed abstractions - their creation, their ambiguity, their levels of generality and their deceptive qualities. A technique is described for the rendering of abstractions concrete through what Stewart calls the "existential sentence."

In Chapter 5, "The Art of Divine Meditation," Stewart claims that meditation (unlike the five paragraph essay or the outline) does not limit freedom or generate mechanical formulations. It therefore allows the writer many choices of routes while still giving a sense of direction to the composing. The pre-writing meditation, derived from traditional religious exercises, consists of a three-part internal colloquy in which the writer raises questions and comes to some conclusions about himself and life. The writing of the composition, says Stewart, follows easily from this process.

Chapter 6 is entitled "Analogy: A New Way of Looking." Most thinking, according to Stewart, is really by analogy, and thinking-by-analogy, like "meditation," can be a "conceptual mechanism" completing the pre-writing process. He gives some examples of simple and complex analogies, and offers advice on the constructing of effective ones.

This is an extraordinary book which attempts to exploit a wide range of cognitive and affective capabilities of the novice writer. For a survey of related theories, see Stewart's "Stand Up

and Cheer for Grubby Prose". Stewart's article suggests methods for evoking writing that is "authentic and unrestrained". The author insists on giving priority to communication, clarity, and effectiveness of organization and style, rather than to spelling, punctuation and correctness.

The Journal

A detailed treatment of the use of the journal for pre-writing heuristics is also provided by Stewart in The Authentic Voice. In Stewart's analysis of invention, the journal belongs to the last stage of inception and the first stage of concept formation: writing in a journal not only comes from thought but may produce thought. A distinction is made between the journal and the diary, the former being more a record of intellectual and emotional growth than a series of factual accounts.

Stewart notes that the journal is not finished writing. It contains impressions and tentative conclusions drawn from these impressions. In these conclusions are the nuclei of essays. Such writing frees the writer from the worry of formal organization, thus fostering the development of an "authentic voice". Stewart includes a collection of representative types of journal entries with many samples for each type. Included among

these sample entries are a report, an interpretation of this report, and an elaboration of this interpretation that is almost a preliminary draft of an essay. He suggests ways of turning observations and reflections on aspects of one day into journal entries. The physical characteristics of journals are described. Finally, Stewart describes the compact between student and teacher: the student will make daily entries diligently; these will not be graded; the teacher will put no marks on the journal; he will look at the entries and will note on a separate sheet what the writer does well; entries will not be used in class without the writer's permission.

Judy, in Explorations in the Teaching of Secondary English, describes the journal as "the one consistent exception to the 'I hate writing' syndrome". It receives "an almost universally positive" student response. When students write in journals, "all problems traditionally associated with writing seem to be almost magically solved". Judy points out, however, that teachers need to find ways of applying the discoveries of the journal to the "regular" work of composition. He also warns that writing for a journal can be done so frequently that students no longer find the experience satisfying.

In "Using Journals With Slow High School Learners", Briscoe states that the journal helps build writing confidence and skill, and that it increases understanding and communication between stude and teacher. She suggests how journals may be started in the classroom, how often students should write, what they should

write about, and how the journal may be individualized. Burton et al observe that journal entries can often form the basis of long papers to be written later. A list of examples of 11th and 12th grade journal entries suggests a wide range of possibilitie for further expansion. Similarly, Shuman sees the journal as a way to lead into later writing assignments. The teacher should therefore invite students to look at the world in new ways, so that their thinking may become more creative. Shuman includes a list of stimulating activities. He also discusses the use of the journal as a basis for class discussion and as a bridge between personal and expository writing. In Teaching English in Secondary Schools, Hipple warns against the psycho-analyzing by teachers of unconscious problems suggested by journal entries. He observes that such intrusiveness can inhibit creativity in writing.

Dictation

Although dictation is a pre-writing activity that has been little discussed in recent work on teaching composition, it seems to have some advantages. According to Rollo Brown, the procedure is simple: the teacher reads aloud the passage to be dictated, discusses some of the words, and then dictates. This exercise is said to be valuable for several reasons: it sharpens powers of

observation and gives the student practice in handling a variety of sentence patterns; it directs attention to grammatical constructions and helps to improve spelling, punctuation and vocabulary; and it exemplifies good standards of speech.

The Research Essay

Many teachers of composition question the advisability of introducing the writing of the "research" paper at the high-school level. In Teaching Composition, a publication of the Colorado State Department of Education, it is reported that most English departments in Colorado believe that the high-school-library "research" paper is a waste of time. Such writing can displace valuable practice in the more fundamental aspects of writing. Often these papers are assigned before students are given training in how to write them, and the resulting product frequently consists of incoherent chunks of undigested, unorganized, and incompletely paraphrased source material.

In suggesting a compromise approach, Hipple, in Teaching English in Secondary Schools, sums up the two sides of the argument. The positive argument is that students who learn how to write "research" papers profit from studying ideas developed by others and from ordering these ideas in patterns unique to their own essays. Moreover, students intending to attend university are thereby prepared for the kind of writing that will later be required by them. The negative arguments are that students rarely have a critical understanding

of what they incorporate into their essays, that they often plagiarize from encyclopedias, that they often fail to recognize original ideas or to cite source material, that the time spent on the "research" essay could be better utilized on more basic writing problems, and that it is not the high-school teacher's responsibility to give instruction in this kind of writing. On balance, Hipple concludes that students lack the knowledge and the maturity of judgement necessary for the methodical conduct of independent inquiry.

Hipple's view is that students should learn how to use a library but that this goal can be achieved without resorting to "research" papers. He suggests, instead, a series of brief assignments which require students to draw up a list of articles on a given topic and then to write a short paper based on two or three items on their list. In this way, they can learn the important skills of summarizing and synthesizing; and they can be taught to avoid plagiarism. They should not have to learn conventional forms for footnotes or bibliographical entries but should know where descriptions of such forms can be found. This author recommends that short, easily handled research assignments be practised frequently throughout the student's high-school years. Some sample assignments are included.

Detailed advice on writing discursive essays is included in most composition handbooks and textbooks. Crews discusses using the library, note-taking, and documenting sources. He includes a sample essay. McCrimmon, too, presents a

detailed set of instructions on these aspects of writing. Similarly, Barnet and Stubbs give detailed instructions, including a sample paper and a note on using computers in research and writing. Stanford and Smith summarize research procedure and include a list of resources for teaching the research paper. Finally, Cohen discusses research and literary interpretation.

SECTION II

WRITING

Words

Many books on the teaching of composition treat the study of words under such headings as diction, vocabulary, usage, and the use of dictionaries. No one source contains anything approaching a comprehensive treatment, and the following observations concern only a fraction of the material available on this subject. Certain questions about the enlargement of vocabulary and the function of words in cognition are discussed in the preceding chapter in sections b(iii) and b(iv) respectively.

Gurrey, in The Teaching of Written English, gives some general guidelines for effective teaching about words. These principles are based on a consideration of the relationship between sensory information and precision of fact, between distinctions of fact and distinctions of meaning, and between the development of language and growth in powers of apprehension. Gurrey also points out that,because meaning depends on both the verbal and non-verbal "context" of an utterance, a context must be 'vital' if learning is to occur. Enrichment of idea goes hand in hand with enrichment of vocabulary.

With respect to diction in particular, Crews discusses ways to avoid redundancy, clichés and jargon. Problems relating to the gender of words, abstraction and overstatement are also part of his argument. McCrimmon comments on denotation, connotation, and euphemism. He considers three qualities of good diction:

appropriateness (with regard to purpose, situation and audience), specificity (with respect to degrees of generality and concreteness), and imaginativeness (with respect to the effective use of figurative language). Finally he discusses revision of diction for vagueness, jargon, and triteness.

Hipple suggests that vocabulary is best developed on a continual basis, not in intermittent lessons. While admitting that word lists are not appropriate for all students, he recommends such popular vocabulary builders as Word Power Made Easy. He points out, however, the limitations of trying to teach vocabulary through word lists in isolation, and stresses that words must be learned in context, preferably from contextual clues. Gurrey in The Teaching of Written English describes several techniques and exercises for helping a pupil to increase his stock of words and to perceive the need for exactness in their use. He also emphasizes the importance of stirring inert, passive vocabularies into purposeful activity and of helping students overcome the linguistic habit of using clichés, set formulas and unvaried diction.

Brown describes a technique which has been used in France for enlarging and organizing vocabulary. A word is first related to the object or idea denoted by it, to words already known, and to synonyms. It is then studied in normal contexts. Another French method of vocabulary-building is the "lesson in things" in which the student, while learning general facts about such subjects as agriculture, manufacturing or botany, augments his vocabulary with words specific to these subjects. Long presents a vocabulary-

building exercise in which students substitute synonyms and antonyms for each word in a given sentence and then add modifiers.

The following items provide information about lexicography relevant to the teaching of composition: Hayakawa's discussion of dictionaries and definitions in Language in Thought and Action; the section called "Dictionaries, Words, and Meanings" in Essays on Language and Usage (see Dean and Wilson); "Linguistics and the Dictionary" in Readings on Applied Linguistics (see Allen); and the section entitled "Words: Forms and Meanings" in Introductory Readings on Language(see Anderson and Stageberg). For a selection of classroom activities involving the use of dictionaries, the following are worth consulting: Crews; Arizona English Bulletins: Volume 15; Burns, Alexander and Davies; and Hipple in Teaching English in Secondary Schools.

Sentences

In this section, the sentence will be considered with respect to its contextual, semantic function in composition. For a consideration of the sentence as a grammatical unit, see the first part of section (v) below. An analysis of the historical emergence and structure of the modern, plain-style, English sentence can be found in Croll.

McCrimmon discusses syntax in relation to the composition of the sentence. He regards the standard sentence, which may be loose or cumulative, as consisting of a main clause (the core of the sentence) plus expansions. The main clause consists of a subject

together with an intransitive verb, or a transitive verb and object, or a linking verb and complement. The expansions are modification, coordination and subordination. Modification (either adjectival or adverbial) may qualify any element in the standard sentence. This is also a means by which the writer can give specific details. Coordination, which can reduce wordiness and monotony, stresses similarity by parallel structure. Subordination, which can also reduce wordiness and monotony, is a means of forming "mature" sentences and controlling emphasis. McCrimmon also deals with the balanced sentence (usually a form for contrast) and the periodic sentence. Under the heading "Revising Sentences," McCrimmon considers ways of achieving clarity, emphasis, economy and variety in sentences. Three sample paragraphs are considered, and aspects of sentence structure (including length, complexity, order, parallelism, type, and variety) are analyzed.

Crews discusses the qualities of effective sentences with respect to definiteness of statement, coordination, subordination, conciseness, variety, consistency of pattern, and sound (repetition and rhythm). Gehle and Rollo analyse qualities of the sentence in terms of variety, point of view, co-ordination, sub-ordination, and coherence. They also discuss sentence fragments, fused sentences, and spliced sentences. Flesch maintains that the shorter the sentence, the better the comprehension.

Punctuation

Most composition texts and handbooks have sections on punctuation. It is refreshing to see an approach to punctuation in which the criteria of clarity and ease of comprehension are uppermost. Such is the treatment of the subject by Logan, Logan and Paterson in a section on "punctuation and meaning" which includes activities and teaching hints. Obenchain, in Links to Forceful Writing, presents a set of highly effective techniques for instruction in punctuation. These techniques, which will be discussed again in section (v) below, treat punctuation as one element in a system of prose connectives that include grammatical forms and lexical links.

The Paragraph

In "The Paragraph: Dancer in Chains" Burke (see Gorrell) provides a brief outline of the history of theories about the paragraph. She warns that narrow schematization must be avoided. Loban, Ryan and Squire discuss planning the structure of a paragraph. While maintaining that the writer must decide what kind of elaboration (e.g. comparison, analysis, supporting detail) is required by the topic sentence, they suggest that the teaching of specific techniques should not be overemphasized.

Specific techniques of paragraph construction are discussed by many rhetoricians. Gehle and Rollo note that the organizational principles according to which a writer builds a paragraph should be suited to the subject and the audience.

Usually there is one controlling principle which may be complemented by subordinate ones. They give a sample using process as the predominant principle of organization, with narrative, illustration, details, examples, causal analysis, and restatement as subordinate elements. Each of these principles as well as several others is discussed in turn, and a statement of the tasks involved in using each is included. McCrimmon treats in some detail what he regards as the four requirements in developing paragraphs: unity, completeness, order of movement, and coherence. He then illustrates the practical application of these requirements in three sample paragraphs with revisions, comments, and additional exercises.

Crews describes ten techniques of paragraph development based on either function performed or order of presentation. Specifically, he suggests that a student can be taught to 1) state a thesis and support or illustrate it; 2) build towards a conclusion or question; 3) develop an explanation; 4) replace one view with another; 5) develop a comparison or contrast; 6) establish a basis for a contrast; 7) use a definition; 8) classify or divide a subject; 9) analyze a statement or passage to bring out its meaning; 10) and move climactically in writing through time or space. Barnet and Stubbs discuss ways of organizing and developing paragraphs with or without topic sentences. They also describe several techniques for unifying ideas and various means of achieving coherence within and between paragraphs. The question of coherence in the paragraph is treated by, among

others, Rogal, Joseph M. Williams, and Elcan.

In considering the attributes of a good paragraph, Caruso and Weidenborner regard unity as the relationship between the general and the specific, that is, between the topic sentence and its supporting details. Such details can be organized by means of examples, illustrations, descriptive statements, or facts from which a generalization has been made. They can also be used to enumerate specific points which are only loosely referred to in the main idea or to identify specific steps in a process. Exercises in practising good paragraph writing are included.

Many instructors have commented on the topic sentence. Gehle and Rollo, for example, discuss its function in establishing the purpose and controlling thought of a paragraph, its placement or omission, and its development from a thesis statement. Hipple, in Teaching English in Secondary Schools, examines the importance of the topic sentence. "Hows and Whys and Whats: Some Thoughts About Constructing Topic Sentences" (see Los Angeles City Schools) suggests a simple linguistic formula designed for writing single paragraph essays on literature.

On the preparation of the final draft of a paragraph, Loban, Ryan and Squire provide a list of editing considerations. These include sentence sense, effective beginnings and endings, unity, concrete and precise diction, coherence, emphasis, and appropriateness of transitions. They also describe two ways of teaching paragraph writing: building a paragraph in class (a procedure described in detail), and presenting strong and weak

models.

For a systematic procedure for teaching the development of paragraphs, see Stanford and Smith. Starting with a list of objectives, they divide the process into four parts: writing a topic sentence; developing a topic sentence into unified prose; arranging details in the best order; and making the paragraph flow smoothly. Each section contains suggestions for the teacher's presentation and a number of related activities. Assessment of the achievement of the original objectives is discussed, and a list of resources is included.

A procedure for teaching paragraph writing by means of an oral game is described by F.K. Bartz in an article in Long's Writing Exercises. A student reads a paragraph he has written. The class interrupts asking for details or explanations and tries by this means to stop the writer from finishing his reading within a set time limit. The writer is expected to write down the answers to the questions asked by the class. Another procedure is suggested in "Nobody Writes a Paragraph" by Trosky and Wood. They describe how students can be instructed first to organize ideas by classifying data, and then to perceive paragraphs as groups of sentences containing related information. The procedure, which can be presented inductively, is relatively simple: listing ideas, grouping them, naming each group, numbering the ideas in the groups, putting the groups in order, and then writing about the ideas in each group.

In "A Tagmemic Approach to Paragraph Analysis" (see Graves),

Becker presents a theory of expository paragraph construction based on two logical patterns and variations of these patterns. Lexical markers, equivalence classes, and lexical transitions are explained and exemplified.

In "On Clockwatching and Composing", Judy (see Graves) argues against the practice of presenting students with model paragraphs. This author not only disapproves of stock paragraph formulations which are rhetorical and removed from good modern writing; he also rejects the assumption that students learn to write by studying abstract structures. He questions the value of any procedure that makes form more important than content. The students' problem, the author claims, is not filling out a priori forms but "finding material appropriate to their message and molding it to a successful shape". This point is likewise stressed by Gurrey in somewhat different terms in The Teaching of Written English.

In "Paragraph Development in the Modern Age of Rhetoric", Meade and Ellis (see Graves) analyse the incidence of various textbook methods of paragraph development in the Saturday Review, the English Journal, and letters-to-the-editor of a daily newspaper. Traditional methods of development were present in fewer than 50% of the paragraphs. The four most frequent methods were found to be based respectively on giving examples, reasons, a combination of both examples and citing reasons, offering a combination of examples and reasons, and making comments - a basis of development not usually discussed in textbooks. The authors conclude that a writer, when choosing a method of development, probably acts in accordance with his purpose; in

other words, the writing of a paragraph is not governed by a preconceived form. The study led Meade and Ellis to pose two questions related to composition teaching. Is there need for direct instruction in particular techniques of paragraph development such as one finds in composition textbooks? And should there be formal practice in techniques which may be used without conscious decision?

Christensen, in "A Generative Rhetoric of the Paragraph" (see Graves), likewise presents conclusions drawn from an analysis of completed paragraphs. On methods of paragraph development, he observes that paragraphs almost always use combinations of methods, and that, structurally, most paragraphs are like cumulative sentences. In fact, Christensen suggests that paragraphs exemplify the same principles proposed for the rhetoric of the sentence, the topic sentence being seen as analogous to the base clause of a sentence and the supporting sentences as analogous to the added sentence-modifiers. This approach to the paragraph as "macro-sentence" or meta-sentence" presumes the existence of "a topic", even though at times it can only be inferred. Christensen arrives at the following conclusions: paragraphs can be defined as a series of structurally related sentences; the leading sentence of the sequence is the topic sentence; the topic sentence is nearly always first, but it varies greatly in its degree of explicitness in designating the thesis of the paragraph; simple sentences are co-ordinate or subordinate. In co-ordinate sequence, coherence is achieved

through repetition of structure not through transitions, whereas repetition of structure in a subordinate sequence must be avoided. Christensen makes the following further observations: a mixed sequence of co-ordination and subordination is most frequent; some paragraphs have sentences at the beginning or end that do not belong to the sequence; concluding paragraphs are rare; some paragraphs are illogical, but "many a run of four or five paragraphs ... can be analyzed as a single sequence, with paragraph divisions coming logically at sub-topic sentences; punctuation should be by paragraph not by the sentence because punctuation usually involves the question of whether or not to make compound sentences.

Braddock approaches the paragraph from a different perspective, basing his findings on an examination of twenty-five pieces of expository prose. He observes that professional writers do not often begin or end paragraphs with "topic sentences" and that many paragraphs have no topic sentences at all.

Extended Discourse

In "A Generative Rhetoric of the Essay," D'Angelo (see Graves) looks at units larger than the paragraph primarily as a sequence of structually related sentences and secondarily as a sequence of structually related paragraphs, the essay being thought of as a macroparagraph. The leading sentence is the first sentence of the sequence, subsequent sentences being related to it by subordination and co-ordination.

D'Angelo's rhetoric is similar to Christensen's analysis of the structure of paragraphs, and is related to Rodgers' paragraph analysis in "The Stadium of Discourse" (see Graves). Rodgers states that he often forms his paragraphs after his writing is completed, whereas Christensen claims that he is always conscious of paragraphing when he writes. D'Angelo believes that generally the truth about the way paragraphing occurs lies somewhere between these two extremes: that is to say, paragraphs are both invented and discovered in the act of writing.

D'Angelo uses a system similar to Christensen's in that he numbers sentences in an extended discourse according to whether they are co-ordinate or subordinate. D'Angelo claims that his way of distinguishing between co-ordinate and subordinate sentences is much simpler than Christensen's, but admits that "there is much more work to be done" in this area of discourse analysis. He concludes that "this kind of analysis suggests there may be a closer relationship between arrangement (dispositio or organization) and delivery (pronuntiatio or manner of presentation) than previously supposed."

Kinneavy, Cope and Campbell offer detailed instruction on the techniques of expressive and informative extended discourse. In a section called "Expressing Yourself," they advise the writer as to establishment of identity, clarification of purpose, organization of material, choice of language, and evaluation of product. Their instructions in "Convey Information" deal with writer, audience, information and the language, as well as various

techniques for achieving factuality, comprehensiveness, and surprise.

Other detailed treatments of the expository essay are to be found in Crews, in Stanford and Smith, and in Gurrey (The Teaching of Written English).

Tone

According to Elcan, tone reveals the writer's attitude toward his subject and audience. Elcan demonstrates how diversity of tone can be achieved by sentence structure and diction. For Crews, tone is the quality of feeling which the writing conveys or evokes. It can be formal or informal, sober or whimsical, assertive or pleading, straightforward or sly. Suitability of tone depends on the writer's personality and purpose. Long includes a useful exercise in synonymy and tone by Thomas W. Wilcox, the point of which is to distinguish variations in tone among apparently synonymous statements.

McCrimmon sees tone as one of two aspects of style (the other being language). Tone, as the sum of the characteristics of a piece of writing, communicates the writer's attitude toward subject and audience, creates his persona (or the personality revealed by the writer), and establishes the relationship between writer and reader. There is a continuum between the informative tone, which explains, and the affective tone, which influences. McCrimmon discusses tone in three sample paragraphs, identifying the tones as being enthusiastic, subjective/objective, and

informative/affective.

Modes

Crews presents a traditional classification of discursive modes: description, exposition, narration, argument, and mixed modes. Ghele and Rollo also take a traditional approach, exemplifying in four model essays four types of non-fiction prose - exposition, narration, description and argument. Gurrey, likewise, in The Teaching of Written English, discusses techniques for giving instruction in the writing of narration, description, and various kinds of expository prose. In Explorations in the Teaching of Secondary English, however, Judy suggests that such traditional modes should not be taught. Rather, he suggests that the form a piece of writing takes should be arrived at pragmatically. For example, one should choose a theme and draw up a list of possible modes of presentation. These could include a story, a drama. Another procedure, in which modes are seen as a function of the writer's purpose and emphasis, is described by Kinneavy, Cope and Campbell. Their "six aims of discourse" can be summarised as follows: expressing oneself; persuading an audience; creating poems, stories, or other artistic forms; exploring a problem; proving a thesis; and conveying information. While noting that these aims overlap, the authors devote one chapter to each and, within each chapter, discuss techniques and patterns appropriate to each aim.

Persuasion

An important element of rhetoric that has not received the attention it deserves is persuasion. Techniques of persuasion, which include such logical aspects of writing as argumentation and demonstration of validity, are treated in most composition textbooks but in a manner far too cursory and superficial to provide an adequate theoretical background for teaching. McCrimmon, who provides some guidance on this matter, defines persuasion as "verbal communication which attempts to bring about a voluntary change in judgment so that the readers or listeners will accept a belief they did not hold before." He presents useful though somewhat fragmentary information, which includes suggestions for changing the reader's judgment, fitting persuasion to the audience, and creating an effect of trustworthiness. He also discusses appeals to emotion, types of inference, the structure of argument, and common types of argument. One of the best and most comprehensive texts on aspects of argumentation is Mills' Reason in Controversy. This book treats such topics as the writer's ethical and logical responsibilities, analysis of a subject, investigation, evidence, reasoning, and the oral and written presentation of argument.

For a simplified but useful treatment of the subject, one might consult Elcan. She provides advice on limiting a topic and on the overall organization of an argument. In offering suggestions on several related matters, she points out that being more interested in winning a debate than in getting at the truth leads to

irrationality; that one should make clear why a matter under discussion is important and what values and goals the writer shares with the reader; and that the writer should acknowledge and account for opposing arguments.

An elementary but useful scheme for proving a thesis is to be found in Kinneavy, Cope and Campbell. After giving several examples of discursive argumentation, the authors discuss the formulation of an argument under two main headings: assembling the evidence and presenting it. The first section is further divided into discussions of inductive and deductive proof, and the second into choice of medium, basic media conventions, and patterns of organization. Barnet and Stubbs also devote a long section to argumentation and persuasion, and Crews offers some helpful advice on making defensible assertions, supplying evidence, and meeting objections. A good exercise in providing support for assertions is provided by Pierson in Writing Exercises (see Long). This exercise consists of a number of sentences intended to prove or illustrate a principal statement, and the student must decide which ones do so and which do not.

One aspect of persuasion and argumentation that has received extensive coverage is logic or reasoning. Unfortunately, however, treatment of this topic has frequently been restricted to an analysis of logical fallacies. For discussions of this kind, see Elcan, Gehle and Rollo, and McCrimmon, who also suggests ways of refuting such fallacies. Loban, Ryan and Squire discuss several other important questions related to logical thinking. They

demonstrate how the writer's purpose controls his selection of observations and how bias may colour his interpretation of a topic. They also provide advice on ways to improve inductive and deductive reasoning, to detect over-simplifications in reasoning, and to discriminate between a sound relationship and one that is false or misleading.

SECTION III

REWRITING

Revising, Drafting, and Checking

The revision of writing can be guided by a checklist of appropriate criteria. An extensive checklist of this kind has been compiled by Crews. By consulting chapter references, the student can study in detail the particular aspect of writing in which he may have a weakness. Crews also describes the conventional requirements of form for such matters as footnotes and bibliographies.

While one conventional approach to rewriting assumes that it is something which is done after a presentable draft has been completed, Murray maintains wisely that "writing is rewriting." Providing a concise checklist, Murray discusses rewriting in relation to the overall order and coherence of an essay, the construction of paragraphs (which may or may not have a topic sentence but which should be unified, coherent, and emphatic), and the composition of sentences (which should have both clarity and forward movement). He emphasizes the importance of diction. Cliché, jargon, and imprecision are to be avoided. Active verbs and concrete nouns are usually to be preferred. Murray suggests that rewriting should be an integral part of the writing process. The teacher should therefore sometimes assist the student to revise his paper several times before the final grading is done. For instance, if a student writes a vague, lifeless paragraph, he should

be shown how to find a vital subject which will invite extensive rewriting and editing. The student should be asked to make a list of details so as to avoid such weaknesses as cliché and unsupported generalization. Murray explains how to select specifics from the list and then organize them by grouping and ordering. The list of details , the first draft, and the outline should all count as pieces of writing.

Shugrue and Hillocks agree with Murray that much of the teacher's correcting should be done before the final draft comes in. They suggest that actual assignments in revision should be given so that the student has plenty of practice in making outlines and writing rough drafts. Such assignments must be carefully planned. Advocates of the pre-structuring method, Shugrue and Hillocks insist that emphasis be placed on the prevention of error because the "salvaging of a mutilated and damned composition dampens a student's enthusiasm." They suggest the use of examples such as Conrad's notebooks to show that great writers "struggle through revision to say what they mean."

In advising the teacher of procedures for revising, Shugrue and Hillocks state that standards of good writing should be established. They are vague, however, on this subject. They recommend that the topic sentence and outline be approved before the rough draft is begun, and that matter and form be stressed above questions of mechanics. Finally, their most compelling point is that emphasis on the process of revision from the beginning of the assignment makes the final correction

easier.

Gurrey, in The Teaching of Written English, suggests that the general aim of teaching composition to senior students should be the organization of thought in relation to the organization of experience. This aim necessarily involves as much rewriting as there is rethinking. Emphasis should therefore be placed on a careful "attending to the subject" and on the purposeful arranging, ordering, and controlling of material to achieve a significant conclusion. Gurrey recommends a general method which is both informal and experimental but which requires that the objective for each writing task be clearly defined and understood. All tasks are in fact to be presented as problems, with the teacher assuming the role of a chairman of discussion, an assessor, and a Socratic questioner. Students thus learn how to be their own best critics. Gurrey describes specific, instructional techniques for compiling data, selecting relevant items, ordering them logically, and arranging them for particular purposes. He also considers the question of unity, suggesting that students write précis of their own work as one effective means of learning the significance of this principle.

It seems clear that revision before the final grading, whether done by the student alone or with the help of the teacher, will produce a superior product. A study conducted by Dudenhefer, involving an experimental group of 43 students and a control group, revealed a comparatively significant reduction in errors in the prose of the experimental group after practice in

revising six compositions prior to grading. The errors referred to, though not clearly specified in the abstract, may have been entirely mechanical. It seems likely, however, that other kinds of errors can be reduced by pre-revision.

Ohmann and Coley claim success with an oral audience-response approach to revision. The student corrects his speech and writing by rephrasing sentences that are not clear to an audience and by modifying the logical order when an audience cannot follow it. His unsupported generalizations are also questioned, so that he must reconsider them or try to corroborate them. Through such exchanges the student can learn how his perception of himself, his subject, and his audience can affect what he wants to say.

Aware that many students consider revision to be an unnecessary and unpleasant chore, Loban, Ryan and Squire address the problem of how to induce the writer to take a constructive attitude to rewriting. He must learn that writing more than one draft is standard procedure, that composing a paragraph is a dynamic not a formulaic procedure, that much rewriting is necessary, and that writing is a valuable way to improve and clarify his thinking and feeling. The problem of motivating students to rewrite is also touched on by the Language Arts Advisory Committee of the Colorado State Department of Education. Their advice, however, comes to little more than an admonition that papers of quality should receive recognition of some kind such as being read aloud or retained in the library.

For a detailed description of a paper undergoing revision, see Gehle and Rollo. Some other useful guides to revision are contained in Stanford and Smith, Barnet and Stubbs, and Shuman.

SECTION IV

SOME CLASSROOM PROCEDURES

Loban, Ryan and Squire have summarized as follows what they consider to be the principles underlying effective instruction in composition:

> Imaginative writing provides experience in expressing and ordering both ideas and experiences and does so in highly personal ways; it contributes significantly to the pupils' over-all development in writing. Pupils must write with a genuine sense of communication; they must have something to say, someone to say it to, and a desire to say it; only then can a teacher help them organize and express it. Pupils must grapple with their own ideas and feelings, consciously shaping them toward effective communication; verbalizing principles and studying models are not sufficient by themselves. The help students receive in generating, organizing, and expressing ideas before and during the actual process of composing is more important than the help they receive after writing. In exposition, pupils need to be taught that a controlling idea is needed for composing; thinking and writing cannot be separated. Practice in actual writing, usually limited to short compositions and aimed at specific problems of achievement, surpasses other plans in effecting pupil achievement. Teachers should plan for a progression in the attainment of specific skills of

> composition; this progression should encompass all the grades of the secondary school. Evaluation of student writing and revision should extend beyond a concern for mechanical correctness; the heart of the matter is clarity, forcefulness and vitality of expression. The best organization of instruction relates composition to the rest of the English curriculum, to other school subjects and activities, and to pupil concerns beyond the school. The complexity and difficulty of teaching writing require careful planning of routines, filing, conferences, and reading of compositions.

The authors of the foregoing passage also describe a number of procedures for applying the principles that they cite. Their long list of activities is divided into categories - on the basis of the following purposes: to awaken intellectual curiosity; to extend and sharpen observation; to explore feelings; to increase ability to interpret; to connect writing with personal needs and interests; to write for practical and immediate uses; to focus on the paragraph; to plan longer compositions; to feature effective beginnings and endings; to improve transitions; to become interested in design; to establish standards; and to acquire an effective style.

Several instructors stress the importance of a favorable classroom milieu. Barr, for example, discusses various classroom seating arrangements and their psychological effects. On a related question concerning the comparative effectiveness of

class and tutorial instruction, a study reported by Budz and Graber suggests that improvement in students' writing can be significantly greater when students are taught as a class. At a more general level, Rice notes that a relaxed, natural environment, in which students are encouraged to talk freely before writing, is most conducive to good writing. He stresses that the teacher should always be positive, should gain the confidence of the students by freeing them from fear of belittlement, and should engage the students in thoughtful experience to stimulate their emotions. Thinking clearly and feeling strongly about a subject lead to effectiveness in composition.

In "Teach Writing as a Process Not a Product," Murray (see Graves) comments on some of the implications of the exhortation in his title. He suggests the students' own compositions serve as their text, and that their writing be studied "while it is still a matter of choice, word by word." According to Murray, students should find their own subjects and their own truth and meaning. Using their own language, they should write as many drafts as is necessary to discover what they have to say, each draft being equivalent to a new paper. Students should also be encouraged to try any form of writing which may help them to discover and communicate what they have to say. Murray asserts that the process that produces creative and functional writing is the same. Mechanics come last: clear meaning is all-important. There should be no time pressure placed on the students; drafts should not be

graded; no absolutes should be taught - only alternatives which enable a student to choose whatever works in a particular context.

On the question of the most appropriate length of composition assignments, frequent short papers are advocated in Teaching Composition (see Colorado State Department of Education). Similarly, Loban, Ryan and Squire hold that, in teaching expository writing, a series of short compositions is better than one long one, especially as the ultimate goal of some high-school students may not realistically extend beyond writing a well-developed paragraph. They say that the long research paper is inappropriate to secondary schools and that the skills needed for such papers can be more easily learned and taught in the short paper.

Opinion is divided as to the degree of routine most conducive to writing. Murray, for instance, believes that deadlines and a ritual of work should be established in order to overcome inertia on the part of students. On the other hand, Loban, Ryan and Squire prefer an integrated approach in which no separate periods are set aside for writing instruction. Such instruction is, in their view, best combined with other activities to which writing can be related. They nevertheless recommend that teachers organize efficient systems for checking and filing student papers and for discussing work with students.

Several instructional procedures have to do with ways by which students may be led painlessly into the actual practice of writing. Especially with younger children, some kind of game may be effective. Graham sets out a variety of gambits designed to

generate work in language and composition. Judy (see Graham) suggests some improvisations based on the notion that good speech leads to good writing. These include role-playing and acting in imaginary situations. Another possibly fruitful procedure is outlined by Waldschmidt in "Peers Paired for Talk-Writing." Following Zoellner's suggestion in "Talk-Write: A Behavioral Approach to Pedagogy," Waldschmidt reports an experiment in which high-school students are paired, one talking out and writing down ideas, the other acting as audience, asking for clarification or for additional details. Supported by the judgment of other teachers of English in the school, Waldschmidt reports a significant improvement in student writing over one semester.

Some Sequential Approaches

Gurrey, in The Teaching of Written English, outlines general principles and specific methods for a sequential, five-year, secondary-school course in written composition. He includes a discussion of the nature of language and techniques for teaching different kinds of writing. Appended are specimen syllabuses and a bibliography.

Graves outlines a five-step procedure for teaching writing at the secondary level. This technique, which the author refers to as CEHAE (an acronym for concept, example, highlighting, activity, and evaluation), requires that one concept at a time be taught in five stages: (1) identification of the concept or principle to be taught; (2) presentation of examples using anthologies, dittoes or

overhead projections; (3) highlighting the specific principle by differentiating it from other material at hand; (4) activity based on the highlighting; (5) evaluation of students' ability to recognize (in reading) and to use (in writing) the concept taught.

Loban, Ryan and Squire outline a procedure for teaching the short composition in three stages: (1) exploring the topic, (2) making a tentative plan, and (3) perfecting the presentation. The first stage consists of questions and discussion; the second includes the composing of a rough draft and consideration of such matters as unity, coherence, and emphasis; the third involves making appropriate improvements as the writer clarifies his sense of purpose and audience. The authors suggest that the process of composing alternates between the production of thought and the structuring of thought.

Another procedure is described in McCrimmon's "A Cumulative Sequence in Composition" (see Graves). This procedure is based on a notion of "rhetorical structure" broadly conceived as any organization of symbols to which the reader responds in any unit of communication. ("Rhetorical structure" in this sense includes both grammar and logic.) McCrimmon's stated purpose is to show how certain principles of organization may be sequentially taught so that each new principle tends to include those preceding it. When a student learns how to handle one kind of rhetorical structure, he can use that knowledge in mastering its sequel.

McCrimmon describes the three main stages of this sequence as

developed for Grades 7, 8, and 9. Stage 1 - Specification - attempts to combat a common tendency among students to make undeveloped, unsupported, unexplained statements. It is best to put the students in situations which require specific responses, especially when writing is being revised. In this way, they learn what kind of specificity is wanted and where. McCrimmon supplies a student paragraph with annotations indicating the kind of specificity required. He further suggests that a paragraph needing revision be put on a transparency and projected for a class discussion. Revision done in this way is more efficient, McCrimmon claims, and the student's attitude toward revision undergoes a change. The best approach to specificity is said to be semantics; therefore some knowledge of the abstract nature of language, especially Korzybsky's abstraction ladder, is needed. McCrimmon includes an exercise based on Korzybsky's concept that "cow_1 is not cow_2." It is basic to specification that class names, or common names, point not to things but to common characteristics of a class. Another exercise in this first stage consists of analyzing a series of paragraphs to see how the general idea in the topic sentence is specified through examples. Stage 2 - Comparison and Contrast - comprises the judging and interpreting of experience by the selection of material and the organization of it to serve various purposes. This forms the basis for the classifying of material. Stage 3 - Classification - is an extension of comparison, a description of what things have in common. By organizing and shaping perceptions, classification

creates new knowledge.

McCrimmon's concern with specificity is echoed by Redd, who discusses how the subject of concreteness can be introduced into the teaching of composition.

A serviceable work dealing with writing compositions about literature is Roberts' Writing Themes about Literature. Roberts gives suggestions for teaching a variety of topics related to the study of literature: characterization, point of view, setting, theme, structure, imagery, tone, prosody, and evaluation. An appendix on writing examinations in English Literature is included. Another useful guide to writing an essay on a literary topic is that of McCrimmon. His first section - "Prewriting the Critical Essay" - illustrates, with examples from short stories, such basic elements of literature as situation, character, dramatic conflict, theme, structure, symbol, and irony. The second section - "Questions of Emphasis" - deals with technical analysis, interpretation, and evaluation. Cohen presents an elementary three-step sequence for the construction of a typical paragraph on a literary topic: 1) generalization, 2) supporting details, 3) interpretation of the details in relation to the generalizations they support.

Groups and Workshops

Shuman describes how students can learn to write by collaborating in groups, and he offers guidelines for the organization and conduct of such instruction. Some advantages of group work are said to be that it stimulates students' thinking,

provides an immediate audience for writing, and facilitates the evaluation of written work by the students themselves. Similar advantages of working in small groups are noted by Murray. In writing for an audience other than the teacher, students may find that they are facing common problems and that they are able to help each other better than the teachers. Through group work students also develop the ability to edit and to think critically. Murray's approach is to select about five students for each group. All students in a group read a copy of an essay written by a peer. Discussion, criticism and rewriting ensue. Murray considers the possibility of students' feeling resentful because the teacher is not "teaching" them to write. He suggests that to avoid this reaction the teacher should create a milieu in which students can learn effectively and then make his own guiding presence clearly felt.

A detailed treatment of group-enquiry techniques is provided by Hawkins. His method is, in part, based on Rogers' five elements of "significant or experiential learning;" 1) personal involvement; 2) self-initiation; 3) change in behavior, attitude or personality; 4) evaluation by the learner; 5) and creative organic flow. Hawkins argues that the "subjective nature of knowledge' makes social interaction imperative. The teacher is seen as a "learning companion" who "creates [an] environment which gives students opportunities to make discoveries that are significant to them. ... Learning is a reciprocal process." As the teacher's ability to question students and to take an interest in what they

are saying becomes evident, students themselves become better questioners and listeners. Questions, however, must be open. The teacher must not have in mind pre-decided "correct" answers but must be receptive to all answers. The goal of such teaching is "to engage students in activities which produce knowledge: defining, questioning, observing, classifying [and] generalizing." Other matters discussed by Hawkins include ways of treating different kinds of students, peer criticism of essays, cooperative and competitive group tasks, and evaluation.

Two further discussions of group work can be mentioned here briefly. According to Simon, Hawley and Britton, the teacher working with a group should be a stimulator of activity, a provider of material, a facilitator of discussion, a clarifier of problems, and an additional auditor of statements. Bruffee describes arrangements for collaborative learning in literature and composition, stressing ways in which students in a writing course can help each other.

The writing workshop or laboratory is described by several authors. Murray gives some useful suggestions about the physical layout and equipment needed for a writing laboratory in the classroom. He advises that students have their own desks which are facing a wall and preferably separated by soundproofed partitions. The teacher should likewise have a glass-walled, accoustically private office for meeting students individually. There should be a table in the centre of the classroom for discussion of papers or common writing

problems and other places where students in small groups can do work such as editing. Murray also recommends that the laboratory have a bulletin board for displaying professional and student writing, a library on writing, and certain equipment such as an overhead projector and tape recorders. Lighting should be adequate. Another treatment of the logistics of the workshop is that of Tiedt, who recommends the use of a mini-centre for each phase of writing. In "A Student Writer's Workshop," Verner (see Clapp) says that students should be so distributed that each group of writers will consist of members with different writing strengths who can help each other overcome specific weaknesses. Judy, in Explorations in the Teaching of Secondary English, sees the writing workshop as having many advantages. It can accommodate individual writing styles, allow many diverse activities to happen at once, encourage students to select interesting new options, free students from the pressure of deadlines, and enable the teacher to act as a consultant. He supplies a checklist of questions for the analysis and evaluation of group dynamics. The list, drawn from H.E. Gulley's "Running Record of Groupness" (in Discussion, Conference and Group Process), suggests ways of facilitating co-operation and making students effective collaborators. R.H. Dow describes an experiment with a writing laboratory for college freshman in "The Writing Laboratory - One Approach to Composition" (see Arizona English Bulletin). Dow based his student-writer's laboratory on the ideas of Murray, Moffett and Kohl. Test results indicate

that the attitude of the student to writing is made more positive by the freedom of the laboratory. Skills, as measured by Dow, are apparently learned when taught either formally or informally.

SECTION V

GRAMMAR AND RHETORIC

In this section, several studies relating to the application of grammar and rhetoric to the teaching of composition will be noted under two headings: (a) improving composition through the teaching of grammar and (b) rhetoric in a school situation. The work referred to constitutes, of course, only a small fraction of the total literature on the subject and, as noted in the introduction to this chapter, these applied studies are neither essentially typical nor fairly representative of grammar and rhetoric as fields of theoretical inquiry.

Improving Composition Through the Teaching of Grammar

Sherwin critically reviews research on the effectiveness of grammar as a means of teaching composition, and provides an extensive bibliography on this controversial subject. His conclusion is that recent research, like earlier studies, "still overwhelmingly supports the conclusion that instruction in formal grammar is an ineffective and inefficient way to help students achieve proficiency in writing." In this subsection, several studies which might significantly qualify this conclusion will be noted. They can be conveniently grouped into three different approaches to teaching composition through the study and constructive use of language structures.

The first approach, which has been carefully tested at the

senior elementary level, consists of several techniques for combining or expanding sentences. These techniques differ from each other both in the way they are applied and in the kind and amount of systematic knowledge about grammar required of the practitioner. Although the effectiveness of some of these techniques in enhancing the development of syntactic maturity as defined by certain quantitative criteria has been clearly established, the evidence that they can also serve to improve writing ability according to certain qualitative standards appears contradictory and of questionable reliability.

A second approach, one developed by Obenchain, makes systematic and extensive use of certain elements of grammar and of a variety of exercises (including sentence-combining) as a means of teaching the understanding and rationally controlled use of prose connectives. Obenchain seems to have demonstrated that this program is highly effective in improving composition skills at the grade nine and ten levels according to several important qualitative criteria. One implication of her work is that the perennial conclusion of researchers regarding the ineffectualness of grammar as a means of teaching composition may now require some substantial revision.

A third approach consists of arguments for teaching students to apply a sophisticated knowledge of grammar to the process of editing and the study of stylistics at the secondary-school level. These arguments have been articulated in somewhat different terms by Gleason and Gurrey (among others), and both maintain that a

knowledge of grammar can be useful in solving certain problems of expression. The arguments of these two theorists will be noted below after a discussion of sentence-combining and a description of the Obenchain program.

Although sentence-combining exercises can be found in traditional school grammars, Mellon elaborated them systematically in accordance with the principles of transformational grammar. He then tested the effect of such exercises on students and discussed his findings in a report, Transformational Sentence-Combining, published by the National Council of Teachers of English. In his introductory review of research on the practical value of instruction in grammar, Mellon notes that traditional school grammar had a double purpose: "teaching principles of correctness, or error avoidance, in language usage ... [and] presenting for inspection and emulation ... what was presumed to be the full range of sentence structure available in the production of mature language...". He further observes that, although many experimental studies had demonstrated that formal correctness in written expression cannot be effectively taught by the teaching of grammatical rules, there had been virtually no research specifically directed to the claim "that grammar practice results in the use of increasingly mature sentence structure." Mellon's experiment therefore involved a study of the performance of students who had been given "grammar practice" (that is, practice in using a systematic range of grammatical structures) through a program of sentence-combining. In addition, students in Mellon's

experimental group were given complementary instruction in the principles of the transformational grammar being used in the practice program. Mellon reports that the students in his experimental classes made significant gains in "syntactic fluency," which he summarily describes as "maturity of sentence structure ... defined, in a strictly statistical sense, in terms of range of sentence types observed in representative samples of student writing." (A factor of prime importance in this quantitative determination of "maturity" was the average number of words per "terminal unit", an item which has been defined as a main clause and all of its modifiers.)

A total of 247 grade-seven students grouped into experimental, control and placebo classes took part in this study. Mellon further reports that some 150 essays written by a total sample of 35 students drawn from each of the three groups were comparatively assessed according to criteria other than "syntactic fluency." Independent raters of these essays were instructed "to base their judgments equally upon the following factors: ideas, organization, style, sentence structure and vocabulary." Remarkably, this impressionistic assessment indicated that "the writing of the experimental group was inferior to that of the subjects [in the control group] who had studied conventional grammar, but indistinguishable from that of the subjects [in the placebo group] who had studied no grammar but had received extra help in composition." As Mellon considers "syntactic fluency" to be only one element in writing ability, he is readily able to

explain this result by "the fact that the highly experienced control teacher was a better composition instructor than both the placebo teacher and the two experimental teachers." (For a relevant general discussion of the problems of reliability and validity in the assessment of writing, see Hirsch.)

Because Mellon's study has been influential in some quarters, several of his other interpretative comments are perhaps worth noting. Specifically, although the rubrics for his students' sentence-combining exercises were manifestly couched in an array of terms derived from transformational grammar, Mellon asserts categorically that the solving of these problems by students did not involve "the conscious application of grammatical learnings during the act of writing." He accordingly attributes their gain in "syntactic fluency" solely to their practice in sentence-combining and not to the study of grammar associated with it. A practical corollary of this argument is that sentence-combining exercises should be used for "the planned enrichment of the student's language environment," even in curricula "which specifically omit the teaching of grammar." Mellon, indeed, expresses the opinion that most students, even at the junior high school level, lack the "cognitive maturity" necessary for thinking "consciously about the 'how' of expression while maintaining at the same time an appropriate concern for the 'what'." With approving references to the work of Moffett (to be discussed below), Mellon suggests that a-rhetorical and a-theoretical sentence-combining should therefore take its place as a beneficial

language activity in curricula designed to foster "natural" linguistic development.

O'Hare later conducted a study which replicated many features of Mellon's experiment. In O'Hare's study, however, the same teachers taught all classes, and the experimental class did not learn a grammatical nomenclature. Instruction in grammar was limited to the identification of various types of "transforms" by means of cue words. The increase in the quantitatively measured "syntactic fluency" of O'Hare's group was even larger, and, in addition, his tests indicated that the quality of the writing of this group with respect to several other criteria also improved significantly.

The experimental studies of Mellon, O'Hare and a number of other investigators in the field of sentence-combining are reviewed by Stotsky. Strong has published a set of completely unstructured sentence-combining exercises devoid of both grammatical terms and cue words. Cooper, in "An Outline for Writing Sentence-Combining Problems" (see Graves), provides a guide for assisting teachers to devise their own grammar-free exercises. Other work on sentence elaboration will be noted below.

In "A Strategy For Teaching Sentence Sense," Graves discusses sentence-combining at some length. He makes the important point that although most students, even slow learners, use both compound and complex sentences in writing and speech, many of them do not know how to bend the form and meaning of the

simple sentence to their will. Sentence patterns, he argues, should be studied not in order to learn their variety but to acquire a repertoire of possible forms by means of which one may most effectively convey one's meaning or achieve the effect desired. That is to say, the emphasis in such study should be on semantic and rhetorical function. Similarly, in learning to make sentences coherent, the student needs to be made aware of the range of subordinating conjunctions and relative pronouns so that he can consider the possible relationships between clauses. Referring to the new sentences formed through sentence-combining, Graves concurs with Moffet's dictum that students should not be required too early to strive for conciseness in their sentences because they "have to spin out long clauses before they can learn to reduce them."

Another technique for using grammar in the elaboration of sentences is outlined by Christensen in "A Generative Rhetoric of the Sentence" (see Graves). His argument is in part a criticism of the sentence-combining approach. He suggests that "we need a rhetoric of the sentence that will do more than combine the ideas of primer sentences. We need a one that will <u>generate</u> ideas (original italics). His central claim is that "the typical sentence of modern English, the kind that we can best spend our efforts trying to teach, is ... the <u>cumulative sentence</u>. ...The cumulative sentence is the opposite of the periodic sentence. It does not represent the idea as conceived, pondered over, reshaped, packaged and delivered cold. It is dynamic rather than static,

representing the mind thinking." Christensen attempts to demonstrate how rhetoric can utilize grammar for the purpose of teaching this form of utterance.

In developing his argument, Christensen analyzes the structure of the cumulative sentence as follows: (i) it consists essentially of modifiers that enrich a bare general assertion in a main clause; (ii) these qualifying modifiers constitute a "direction of movement" in prose; (iii) "direction of movement" can be understood semantically in terms of levels of generality or abstraction; (iv) "direction of movement" also makes for a stylistic texture which can be described grammatically. Students should therefore be taught to compose sentences by adding modifications to a main clause. Such additions, moreover, should be "based at first on immediate observation requiring the student to phrase an exact observation in exact language." Because modifications and "direction of movement" are also structural principles, they involve the grammatical character of the sentence. A study of grammar is therefore the foundation for Christensen's rhetoric, and the particular kind of grammar that he uses in his program is "a combination of immediate-constituent and transformation grammar" as synthesized by Paul Roberts in English Sentence. This, he suggests, "best displays the layers of structure of the English sentence," while providing the teacher and student with a language for talking about sentences and for analyzing their structural texture. Christensen argues, indeed, that a knowledge of sentence form generates ideas. In a

subsequent article, "A Generative Rhetoric of the Paragraph," Christensen describes an analogous technique for teaching this larger unit of discourse. This technique likewise consists of analysing structural patterns and practising the use of them through the process of addition.

In "On Teaching Christensen Rhetoric," Grady addresses the common criticism of Christensen's system that it stresses narrative-descriptive writing unduly. Grady offers some suggestions as to how to "transfer training" from narration and description to exposition and how to apply Christensen's principles to the composition as a whole. Grady argues that Christensen's initial emphasis on narrative-descriptive writing is pedagogically sound as it invites the student to observe action and events closely and to record them precisely. The student can learn patterns of expression in the description-narration of the tangible and observable, and then use those same patterns in the exposition of matter that is more abstract.

Christensen's central claim that the cumulative sentence is the typical sentence of modern English is rejected by Walker (see Graves) in "The Common Writer: A Case for Parallel Structure." Walker found from an inductive study of ten twentieth-century writers that only 7.9% of their sentences were cumulative. He concludes that students should be taught methods of subordination, and coordination, ways of organizing principle clauses, and the structure of all types of sentence, including the cumulative sentence. Sentences, he urges, should be taught "in sequence, and

the function of various types of sentences in context. For example, the short simple non-cumulative sentence to vary pace, to pile up detail ... to make transitions, and to form topic sentences...."

In "On the Practical Uses of a Grammatical System", Tibbetts (see Graves) presents a detailed appraisal of Christensen's approach. On the positive side, he says that Christensen's grammar can be easily taught in schools and that it contains "some of the best exercises on subordination in modern school texts." It also shows students how to avoid "pretzel prose" consisting of "lumpy, vague subject clusters. . . connected to lumpy, vague complement clusters linked by a form of to be." Furthermore, says Tibbetts, Christensen understands the proper relationship between grammar and rhetoric. Tibbetts, however, sees certain weaknesses in Christensen's program. Christensen is too absolutist in his dicta. He subscribes to what Tibbetts calls "the fiction fallacy" or the notion that fiction is of great value in teaching students to write. What is wanted in expository writing, claims Tibbetts, "is accuracy rather than cleverness." Tibbetts also criticizes Christensen's grammar-rhetoric because it does not teach thinking, and he suggests that "the better we can teach students to write 'truthful' sentences ... the better writers they are likely to become." Questioning the validity of Christensen's belief that the grammatical form of a sentence can generate ideas, Tibbetts argues on the contrary that a writer's ideas will suggest form.

Arena suggests yet another technique for improving composition skill by teaching the grammar of sentences. He first discusses the probable usefulness of various grammatical models in increasing writing skills. Traditional and structural grammars,he concludes, are probably of no help to the writer, whereas transformational grammar is probably of some value. This conclusion is supported by references to Mellon and others.Arena then describes his own experiment in which he taught a clause-analysis technique reflecting a grammatical system of English based on a tagmemic model. Weaker students were also given individual instruction in a small number of principles of expository writing. Arena reports that clause-analysis by students of their own compositions led to the elimination of such errors as misplaced modifiers, dangling participles, fragmentary expressions, and lack of parallelism.

Moffett, in Teaching the Universe of Discourse, critically reviews theoretical work on sentence-combining in the context of his own "dialogical" approach to teaching sentence structure. Noting that qualification of thought and elaboration of sentence structure develop together, Moffett argues that the "most important and successful" way of learning the linguistic forms required for the thoughtful elaboration of sentences is by "internalizing the whole give-and-take of conversation." In so doing, the interlocutor naturally synthesizes the elements of discourse by various syntactical means and thereby learns without conscious effort structural patterns which can be later used to

shape his own sentences. The writing of such sentences is then, in Moffett's opinion, only a matter of tran$cription requiring merely mechanical skills. Moffett further suggests that any practice in the written restructuring of written sentences be based on statements in a student's own composition (rather than on contrived sentences in exercises) and that it be done for the purpose of thoughtful revision after a "dialogical" consideration of meaning. To be effective, this preliminary conversation should fully "exploit the processes of expatiation and emendation characteristic of discussion."

A second approach to improving composition skills through the teaching of grammar has been explored by Obenchain. In "Developing Paragraph Power Through Sentence Combining," Obenchain observes that all sentence-combining programs are designed to train students how to add subordinate constructions to main clauses. She argues, however, that programs taking a "purely linguistic approach" are neglecting to "explain to students that they are subordinating the idea which they express in a subordinate construction as they link it to an idea that they are emphasizing." As a consequence, it is possible for students in such programs to learn to write prose characterized by conciseness and "syntactic maturity" yet lacking in logic, coherence, unity and controlled emphasis - all qualities of good writing. In Obenchain's opinion, "the erroneous theory that students do not need to know how their language works, that they need only to practise using it, disregards two indisputable facts: the sole

purpose of language is to communicate thought, and the sentence structure which we use has an undeniable effect upon the ideas we are attempting to communicate." "Syntactic maturity" as a formal characteristic of prose becomes an element of superior writing, therefore, only when a writer "knows how to use sentence structure to lend emphasis to his point."

Obenchain's own program is designed to teach students at the grade-nine and grade-ten levels to write prose that is both syntactically mature and substantively forceful. Its distinguishing characteristic is not, however, the sentence-combining that forms part of the course. Nor is it to be found in the variety of ingenious exercises for the identification of sentence patterns, the correction of errors, the imitation of model sentences, and the analysis of literary texts. Nor does it lie in the conventional punctuation, the traditional grammatical terms, or the ordinary principles of grammatical correctness and compositional logic which are also part of the program. The uniqueness of Obenchain's method can be explained by the fact that all of these elements are combined, by one means or another, into a program for systematic instruction in what may be the most difficult single step in the process of composing: the linking of ideas. Everything in Obenchain's course is, indeed , designed to develop in students a systematic knowledge of prose connectives and a conscious control of their use.

Lexical, grammatical and logical techniques for coordinating and subordinating ideas in sentences and paragraphs are thus the

focal points of instruction. Students are required, in fact, to master through exercises the use of some fifty lexical connectives ranging from coordinate and subordinate conjunctions to conjunctive adverbs and relative pronouns. Various subordinate grammatical constructions (such as participial phrases and appositives) are also learned, and all these forms of linkage, along with certain logical principles, are taught with careful attention to systems for punctuating them.

The exercises making up this program, which Obenchain has published in a two-part text, Links to Foreful Writing, can be corrected partly by students themselves, although the responses to questions in all exercises are written for an audience that has been precisely identified by the instructor. Another notable feature of this program is that many of the exercises are based directly on material in literary texts, a relationship discussed by Obenchain in "Effectiveness of the Precise Essay Question in Programming the Sequential Development of Written Composition Skills ... ." Writing is thus linked to reading comprehension.

Obenchain reports that tests written by students before and after working through her course indicate not only high gains in their "syntactic maturity" (as defined by some of the statistical indices devised by Kellog Hunt and used by Mellon and O'Hare) but also measured improvement in their ability to present ideas grammatically, coherently and emphatically. In testing this ability, Obenchain managed to reduce the subjective factor (which figures so largely and suspiciously in impressionistic and

holistic methods of scoring) by first asking students for a precise answer to a precise question about a literary text and by then using that text as an objective point of reference for the identification of errors in coherence and emphasis.

Obenchain thus seems to have demonstrated that a certain kind of language instruction that focuses on ways of linking ideas through punctuation, certain language constructions, and various lexical connectives can measurably improve writing skill according to several qualitative criteria. To be successful, such instruction must concentrate on the ligatures of written discourse and give students frequent practice in using them through a sequence of well-designed exercises. In the context of recent research, the significance of this finding can scarcely be overemphasized. (For a discussion of other key elements in the Obenchain program, see section b(iv) in the preceding chapter.)

A third approach to improving composition through the teaching of grammar is suggested by Gleason in the concluding chapter of Linguistics and English Grammar. It should be noted that this work was written by a linguist for teachers of English, and it remains an invaluable introduction to a complex subject. What Gleason provides is a scholarly anatomy of various kinds of grammar (including several, modern, school grammars but excluding recent neo-Firthian work in the field). Treating his subject both historically and comparatively, he identifies assumptions, problems and limitations implicit in several grammars yet manages to describe something of the consensus that exists among scholars in this controversial field of study. His main emphasis is on the

theoretical underpinnings of "those approaches to English syntax which may at the present time be considered live options for the American high school or junior high school." His discussion, however, also dwells on such related topics as language variation, language comparison, literary form and style, and the application of grammar to problems of clarity, redundancy, and ambiguity in writing. A useful, annotated bibliography is appended to the work, although few items listed are specifically concerned with classroom procedures for the teaching of composition.

Gleason strongly recommends that grammar with a new syllabus be rehabilitated in the schools - an argument which he further develops in "What Grammar?". Part of his case rests on the potential usefulness of grammar in teaching composition. Gleason suggests that the writing process can be regarded as consisting of two halves: free writing and editing. While free writing involves an internalized grammar that is "outside awareness," editing requires an ability to bring grammatical questions sharply into focus and to deal with them explicitly. Such questions have a bearing on some three aspects of language use: the consideration of structure and of alternatives in structure; the correlating of variations in language with differences in rhetorical function; and the solving of recalcitrant problems in style. Gleason also observes that grammar is an essential element of stylistics, a subject which can provide an integrating link between the study of literature and the teaching of composition.

While urging that grammatical ideas and techniques be

employed "extensively and effectively" in the teaching of composition, Gleason also suggests that this grammar be, within itself, "a coherent, intellectualy respectable and teachable system." It should be based on sound general linguistic principles yet focussed specifically on the English language. Attention should center, moreover, on the "phenomena of language and their functions, rather than on terminology or rules." By this, Gleason means that "understanding must be made more central than the [terminological] apparatus" of whatever grammar - or grammars - are taught. He also means that the grammatical aspects of language should be looked at in the context of a broad system of communication that includes the structural signals described by phonology, the systematic features of written English, and, where appropriate, a disciplined consideration of both the structure of meaning and alternative structures for expressing the same point. Such a context should also make clear how the grammatical features of language "are adapted to the meeting of a complex set of human requirements." In other words, "grammar must be functional, not in the simplistic sense of selecting only those points that are directly useful, but in the sense of emphasizing the function along with the internal architecture of language."

This proposition has several practical corollaries. One is that grammar is to be studied in the context of whole discourses with attention to both the grammatical features of sentence connections and those structural principles of discourse which transcend grammar. Another is that the treatment of structural

relationships and patterns should be sophisticated enough to enable students to apply their knowledge in resolving stylistic problems. A third is that variations in the patterns of language described by grammar be understood functionally in relation to the rhetorical requirements of speaker, audience and situation, and with due regard to historical changes in patterns of language use. It should be noted that Gleason's Linguistics and English Grammar does not define a course of study but a rationale for such a course.

Gurrey likewise discusses the applicability of grammar to the teachingof composition in The Teaching of Written English and Teaching English Grammar. The latter work was written in response to J.R. Firth's plea "for the restoration in the schools of a suitable language in which children can talk about their language as a vital part of their experience." Gurrey accordingly defines grammar as "a description of the forms, structures and grammatical functions of common occurence in the use of a language, and of the way that these play their part in various situations in real life - one of their main purposes being to express meaning." Observing, however, that the main way to develop a pupil's ability to write is through ample practice in writing, Gurrey suggests that any teaching of grammar which displaces such practice, or which is not closely linked to it, should be avoided. Study of language and of the grammar of language can be useful only if such study is the right kind in the right context.

In a chapter entitled "What has grammar to do with linguistic

ability?" Gurrey agrees with proposition sometimes advanced by linguists that the use of language for most everyday, commonplace purposes is an automatic or semi-automatic activity requiring only a limited awareness of the meanings of words and of their full contextual implications. He nevertheless suggests that when language is used as scaffolding for thinking or for solving problems, much more is involved than the automatic and intuitive skills associated with the spontaneous production of speech or writing. In Gurrey's view, a command of language as an instrument of thought requires, in addition, "the manipulation of an active and expressive vocabulary and of a diverse and adaptable sentence structure, combined with a logical and discriminating management of the relations of words." This control of language should, in turn, be the result of "a sense of the orderliness and interrelatedness of thought and feeling and mental attitude." It cannot be a merely "supple" manipulation of words and verbal structures, for it often plays a purposeful part in clarifying subtle realities of human experience. It must sometimes be a highly conscious activity. Gurrey is therefore critical of those theorists who would either reduce all linguistic activity to spontaneity or underestimate the potential power of mind to choose certain forms of expression as a means of thinking or expressing meaning. One curricular implication of this argument is that secondary-school students should learn enough about the grammatical structure of their language to appreciate how structure affects meaning and how meaning can be purposefully and

deliberately altered through changes in structure. Another practical implication is that students should be required to study only those aspects of language that can be directly related to their expression of meaning. Gurrey is therefore critical of theorists who suggest that advanced or scientific theories of language be taught in the schools. His point is that, although such theories may have descriptive validity (and may indeed be an appropriate subject for a few senior secondary-school pupils), such study can offer little of practical value to most students, whose primary need is to learn the practical use of language. (It might be noted that in the 1960's Gurrey's approach was highly recommended by the Ontario Department of Education for use in Ontario schools.)

Yet Gurrey also has strong reservations about much school grammar and traditional methods of teaching it. He takes note of H.B. Reed's study of oral English spoken by children, in which some 15,676 errors were analyzed. Reed apparently discovered "that 71% of the errors occurred in the use of wrong verbs, syntactical redundancies, confusion of past tense with the perfect, concord, and double negatives." Gurrey, while agreeing that students need help with such difficulties, nevertheless suggests that such errors in correctness are usually best dealt with incidentally in particular instances as they occur. The primary aim of school grammar should, in his opinion, be something much more important: the teaching of practical techniques for the expression of meaning and for the conscious manipulation of

structures of language. Gurrey also observes that school grammar has almost always been taught prescriptively rather than inductively and that it has often been based on inaccurate and misleading definitions of parts of speech. By emphasizing parsing and analysis, traditional grammar has focused attention on the isolated word, phrase, clause or sentence, without adequate consideration of the contextual significance of such elements. Furthermore, it has been taught too often as a theory of language rather than as a means of controlling structure in the practice of writing. In Gurrey's view, no language study would be preferable to studying language in these ways.

Gurrey therefore recommends teaching grammar by means of several heuristic procedures, which he describes in some detail, and through an abundance of practice in using the structures studied. His suggestion is that this kind of language study for students at the secondary level is a necessary and useful part of learning how to write well. Gurrey's claim, however, is a limited one: students can be trained through a systematic study of grammar (as he defines it) how to address certain problems of thought and expression consciously and directly - and therefore efficiently - when intuitive solutions are inadequate or unforthcoming. Such a study can also help to develop a conscious sense of "how language can be moulded, trimmed and shaped" in order to express meaning effectively. Both these skills, it should be noted, belong properly to the redaction of writing rather than to its spontaneous production.

Rhetoric in School Situations

Renewed interest in rhetoric in the United States has resulted recently in a wealth of advanced studies by such theorists as Becker, D'Angelo, Kinneavy, Larson, Ong, Pike, Weaver, Winterowd and Young. Bibliographical reviews of this theoretical work, which falls outside the scope of this survey, can be found in the essays of Corder, Corbett, and Young in Teaching Composition (see Tate). The notes below will be narrowly confined to a few of those many studies which either comment generally on the application of rhetoric to the teaching of composition at the school level or discuss specifically the relationship between modes of discourse and language learning.

Corbett's Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student, although designed as a text for post-secondary students, contains much general material that would be helpful to a teacher at any level. Corbett provides a description of traditional principles of composition (including techniques for discovering arguments, arranging material and analyzing style), an historical survey of rhetoric, and a well-selected bibliography.

Rhetoric: A Unified Approach to English Curricula, published by the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, presents lesson, unit, and course plans designed for school use, together with an outline of the history of rhetoric and an extensive bibliography. The aim of this monograph is to "recommend and in part describe an English program that is unified by rhetorical considerations."

Another useful text is the manual for pre-service and in-service English teachers prepared by Dauterman. This focuses on the background and theory of written composition and on rhetoric in a broad sense. The topics covered include the following: a history of composition and rhetoric; arrangement; invention; style; theories and methods of teaching written composition; and composition and the curriculum.

A useful article on rhetoric, concentrating particularly on the art of persuasion, is Larson's "Teaching Rhetoric in the High School" (see Burton and Simmons).

Karl Wallace believes that much present teaching of rhetoric has lost its relevance to life. For him, the proper subject matter of rhetoric is "the thought, opinion and information revealed in the great persisting and unresolved problems of a civilization and culture." Rhetoric must be re-established in the classical sense of practical discourse. Furthermore, he contends, teachers should consider not only the means of communication but also the morality of these means.

In "Rhetoric 2001," Coe urges teachers to deal directly with the communication process and to avoid linear thinking, Cartesian reasoning, and simplistic ideas of causality. He advises that teachers stress the complex interrelations of causes and effects, the complex relationships between the parts of a system and the whole, and the interconnectedness of events and their context.

Marder, in another theoretical essay, postulates a continuum of discourse ranging from the reporting of facts to complex

poetic utterance. Assuming that the aim of discourse is agreement between a communicator and a receiver, he suggests that kinds of discourse can be differentiated according to the means used to achieve agreement.

Mader asks why arguments consisting of a precise representation of reality often fail to be persuasive. He offers a philosophical and psychological explanation of human motivation, making it clear that persuasive discourse, to be effective, must go beyond the merely logical presentation of relevant facts, valid inferences, and sound judgments. On the other hand, Tate, in "Searching for a Romantic Rhetoric," maintains that validity, rather than persuasiveness, is of paramount importance in communication, especially in school composition. Tate argues that much modern rhetorical theorizing is not usefully applicable to the practical needs of the composition teacher. Rhetoric, he says, needs to be concerned with the search for truth, not merely with the manipulation of audiences.

Many teachers who have tried to adopt rhetorical approaches to teaching writing have noted the difficulties inherent in writing for an audience which is largely unknown. Ong addresses this problem, noting that, in most or perhaps all writing, the writer must invent most of the characteristics of his audience.

An experimental course taught to college seniors to determine whether or not instruction in a "tagmemic" discovery procedure significantly improves ability to inquire into ill-defined problems and to communicate results effectively is

described in a monograph by Richard Young and Frank Koen. The course was based on the first half of Rhetoric: Discovery and Change by Young, Becker, and Pike. Young and Koen report that the ability of their students to analyze problematic situations improved, that their students became more skilful in testing the adequacy of hypotheses, and that their essays became clearer and more persuasive.

The rhetoric program of the Oregon Curriculum Study Centre (see Kitzhaber) stresses effectiveness rather than correctness. Although this is a sequential program with a variety of emphases, the unity of the "rhetorical act" is constantly stressed. Students are led to see that rhetoric can be used as a means of achieving certain ends and to discover that rhetorical considerations - few terms of rhetoric are used in the course - complement each other. While invention and arrangement are of much importance, purpose is central. Assignments, therefore, should suggest procedures by means of which specific ends can be achieved. The rhetorical act is structured through substance (content), structure (organization, development and emphasis), and style (special qualities of language which aid effectiveness). All three elements are taught each year, and the sequential movement is from concrete to abstract, from simple to complex, and from experience of oneself to experience of others.

A sequence of lessons in rhetoric, aimed at the grade-four level but applicable (in a modified form) to the work of considerably older children, is suggested by Fichtenau in "Teaching Rhetorical

Concepts" (see Larson, Children and Writing in the Elementary School). The lessons deal with audience, purpose, invention, and style.

Loban, Ryan and Squire treat a wide range of topics having to do with relationships between language, semantics and rhetoric. This discussion includes a consideration of language and motivation, the emotional effects of language, and difficulties in accurate communication.

Britton has observed the development of writing abilities among a sample of secondary school students in England, taking into consideration their use of language in several subjects across the curriculum. Specifically, he reports the findings of an extensive survey of different kinds of student writing analyzed according to function and audience. Although this report says little about teaching methods, two of its implications are that writing should be taught in the contexts of all subjects with considerable attention to the question of audience, and that writing by students should be much closer to the speech of students than it is at present. Both of these implications are discussed in Writing and Learning Across the Curriculum (see Martin) and in the Bullock Report. The latter document, in fact, was written with Britton's assistance and makes use of his well-known categories for classifying writing - the poetic, the expressive and the transactional. For a rigorous critique of Britton's theoretical assumptions, survey methods, and analytical categories, see Williams.

In Teaching the Universe of Discourse, Moffett employs a system of rhetorical analysis not unlike that of Britton in order to describe a set of discourse modes and to suggest a rationale for teaching them in a sequence governed by the degree of "abstraction" characteristic of each mode. Moffett defines "abstraction", however, not in terms of levels of concreteness in the content of discourse but by reference to the structure of the relationship obtaining between speaker, subject and listener. The less speaker-centered (or "egocentric") the structure, the more abstract the discourse; and by "discourse" Moffett means "any verbalization of any phenomena, whether thought, spoken or written." Discourse in this structural sense transcends all language arts while informing each of them. In Moffett's opinion, the most effective, efficient,and "natural" way of having students explore this discursive universe is through talk, discussion and other forms of oral communication. As various modes of discourse are thus mastered or acquired, articulation and comprehension of thought, whether in speech or writing, become a relatively simple matter of linguistic encoding or decoding in one sign system or another.

Moffett spells out the practical implications of this approach in a second work, A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum, K-13: A Handbook for Teachers. Here he links his description of the development of children's discursive abilities with Piaget's hypothesis about the developmental de-centering of children's thinking and with certain other speculative notions

regarding the developmental relationship between speech and writing. (For critiques of Piaget's notion of de-centering however, particularly as it relates to language development, see Donaldson and Vygotsky.)

Vygotsky, in his discussion of the dialectical relation between "thought and language" analyzes levels of abstraction in discourse as determined by mode of expression and audience. Vygotsky, in fact, describes vocal speech, inner speech and written speech as separate linguistic functions differing radically from each other in both structure and mode. Noting, moreover, that the development of writing does <u>not</u> repeat the developmental history of speaking - an observation which seems to have been less than fully understood by some of his interpreters in the English-speaking world - Vygotsky attempts to explain why at certain periods a schoolchild's "linguistic age" in writing lags as much as six to eight years behind his "linguistic age" in speaking.

This explanation is based on several considerations, all of them having to do with the comparatively high degree of abstraction required by written discourse. One is that writing is speech in "thought and image only, lacking the musical, expressive, intonational qualities of oral speech." Because writing also requires the replacement of words by images of words, it employs a secondary system of symbolization that is much more abstract than the sound system used in oral speech. Vygostsky suggests, in fact, that writing "must be as much harder than oral speech for

the child as algebra is harder than arithmetic". A second consideration is that "writing is speech without an interlocutor, addressed to an absent or to an imaginary person or to no one in particular." Whereas in conversation "every sentence is prompted by a motive" and "the changing motives of the interlocutors determine at every moment the turn oral speech will take," writing must result from motives that are "more abstract, more intellectualized, further removed from immediate needs. In written speech, we are obliged to create the situation, to represent it to ourselves." This involves "detachment from the actual situation" and a second kind of abstraction. A third consideration - and one which constitutes Vygotsky's original contribution to the problem - is that written speech is not a transcription of oral speech but a "translation" of inner speech, inner speech being much more condensed than either oral or written speech. Vygotsky comments on this process as follows:

> Writing also requires deliberate analytical action on the part of the child. In speaking, he is hardly conscious of the sound he pronounces and quite unconscious of the mental operations he performs. In writing, he must take cognizance of the sound structure of each word, dissect it, and reproduce it in alphabetical symbols, which he must have studied and memorized before. In the same deliberate way, he must put words in a certain sequence to form a sentence. Written language demands comscious work because its relationship to inner speech is different from that of oral speech: The latter precedes inner speech in the course of development, while written speech follows inner speech and presupposes its existence (the act of writing implying a translation from inner speech). But the grammar of thought is not the same in the two cases. One might even say that the syntax of inner speech is the exact opposite of the syntax of written speech, with oral speech standing in the middle.

> Inner speech is condensed, abbreviated speech. Written speech is deployed to its fullest extent, more complete than oral speech. Inner speech is almost entirely predicative because the situation, the subject of thought, is always known to the thinker. Written speech, on the contrary, must explain the situation fully in order to be intelligible. The change from maximally compact inner speech to maximally detailed written speech requires what might be called deliberate semantics - deliberate structuring of the web of meaning.

Vygotsky's study also includes an analysis of the formation of "spontaneous" and scientific concepts, a brief rationale for the teaching of grammar, a critique of Piaget's description of linguistic development, and a discussion of the role of instruction and language in child development. It should be noticed that Vygotsky's exponents outside the U.S.S.R. have seen in his work differing and even contrary practical implications for the teaching of composition in the mother-tongue. For a review of post-Vygotskian, Soviet research into the deep semantic structure of inner speech, see Luria. This research appears to confirm a proposition that poets have long been advancing: in that fertile field of the brain where thought is transmuted in words and words into thought, words both reflect thought and, to a large degree, form it. Such a proposition is, of course, quite inconsistent with behaviourist theories which assert that "language" is merely an adjunct to "thoughts" that arise from natural and para-linguistic "experience."

Hirsch proposes "relative readability" as a "universal normative principle for writing." In Hirsch's definition, "relative readability" means the "intrinsic effectiveness" of

writing with respect to the conveying of meaning to readers. It is essentially an objective quality determined by the organisation of "mnemonic units" in written discourse. Hirsch argues that the validity of this principle is based on well established facts concerning the "operations of memory in language processing". One such fact is the short-term memory's inability to retain more than a few items for more than an instant. He describes a technique for applying the principle "relative readability" to the assessment of writing and offers related practical advice on teaching methods, textbook selection, and promising lines of research. In introductory chapters, Hirsch discusses functional and formal distinctions between dialects and a national "grapholect", commenting astutely on the question of relativity of standards regarding language.

In "Picking up the Thread," Whalley (see Gold) explores the meaning of literacy as a quality of intellectual cultivation and discusses its place in relation to humane studies whose primary concern is language. He observes that in English studies "there is of course no one 'answer' in 'technique:' the work under inquiry commands the method of inquiry - which is what 'method' means... ." Noting that "it is very difficult to contrive technical exercises that will develop competence in writing," Whalley suggests that one of the best ways to prepare to use language is to study "the dynamics of any writing we admire." Such study, however, ought to concentrate on language itself and not be guided by "crude" and "inappropriate" assumptions about

such matters as "motivation," "audience-appeal", and "communication." In "Where are English Studies Going?", Whalley (see Gold), argues that "communications theory" has, in fact, been the source of grotesquely inadequate definitions of the nature and functions of language.

Priestley (see Gold) also discusses the notion of "communication," noting that "there is a tendency to talk of 'communication' without paying much attention to what is communicated, to whom, by whom, and under what conditions." Priestley does not deny that "for most of the ordinary man's ordinary conversation" the language of everyday speech, which can be learned without much formal instruction, serves perfectly well. He suggests, however, that certain modes of "communication" require precision in the use of language and that "awareness of the possibilities of precision" can be developed only by a rigorous study of the language. Such study should, in his opinion, include grammar, composition, vocabulary, and a "close consideration of a variety of styles."

SECTION VI

RESPONDING TO WRITING

There seems to be no clear agreement among teachers about the meanings of terms such as "marking", "correcting", and "grading" and "evaluating." In this review, "grading", and "evaluating" refer to the assessment of the quality of a piece of writing as a whole according to certain criteria. "Marking" and "correcting" refer to responses to writing which draw attention to its specific strengths and weaknesses in order to give instruction and encouragement to the student writer. "Responding" will be used as a general term for all aspects of comment and evaluation.

A Traditional Procedure

In Teaching the Mother Tongue in Secondary Schools, Gurrey says that the primary aim of instruction in written composition should be teaching students how to write effectively. Both practice in writing and the development of a conscious understanding of what makes for different kinds of effectiveness are therefore essential. A secondary aim should be teaching how to write correctly. This likewise requires practice as well as the development in the student of a feeling of responsibility for amending his own mistakes. With respect to both aims, the training of pupils rather than the perfecting of compositions is what matters, and learning how to scrutinize completed work is an essential element in this training. Gurrey recommends that

certain procedures be followed, and he briefly describes these.

Specifically, a conscious understanding of the means of achieving various kinds of effectiveness should be developed by asking students to "look at their own work to find out how far the assigned task has been successfully carried out." This criticism by each student of his own work can be stimulated by a preliminary discussion of the original aim or intention in the assignment. Students should then be asked to place a mark by those lines or paragraphs that seem most successful. Passages marked as especially effective can be read aloud, with the student giving reasons for his choice. Other members of the class should be invited to comment on the good qualities of the passage cited and to make suggestions for further improvement. This critical evaluation of completed work should be carried out week after week, with the emphasis in discussion always on "how to describe, how to explain, or how to put forward arguments convincingly."

Instilling in students a feeling of responsibility for correcting their own writing is difficult. Gurrey argues that the key to success lies in teaching students the habit of noting and dealing with mistakes. As some training in this practice is usually required, Gurrey suggests that certain regimens be followed with frequent variation. These can be summarised as follows: each student looks through his own work for errors, notes at the bottom of each page the total number found, and corrects as many as possible; each student checks the spelling of all long or uncommon words used in an essay; the teacher indicates to a student, en

passant, the line or paragraph containing a mistake but not the mistake itself (unless the student is quite incapable of finding it); students exchange their books, underline mistakes without making corrections, note the number of mistakes at the bottom of the page, and return the books to each writer for correcting; students follow the foregoing procedure but each writer must find the number of mistakes missed by the corrector; each student graphs his errors (either compositely or separately) for a term or year; the teacher undertakes with the help of the class an "error frequency count" for different kinds of composition; the teacher invites the class to scrutinize the corrected proofs of a book; the teacher invites the class to correct his own typescript; students write for a class magazine and then act as their own editorial staff.

On Not Grading Compositions

Although most teachers probably see the need for grading student compositions as self-evident, some theorists have suggested that grading may be not only unnecessary but also harmful in the teaching of composition. Perhaps the strongest critic of grading is Judy, who, in Explorations in the Teaching of Secondary English, points out some of the disadvantages of this practice: grading often deals with trivial matters; it induces a false competitiveness among students; it is rarely based on the consistent application of precise criteria; and it has a negative effect on the student's self-esteem. After

citing the decision of the Ad Hoc Committee on Grading (see NCTE) that grading eventually be abolished, Judy suggests some interim grading plans: (1) "self-evaluation", (2) grading based on "sheer quantity", and (3) "contract grading." In "self-evaluation", students recommend their grade and submit an explanation of the recommendation. In grading based on "sheer quantity", point values are assigned to various tasks, and the points are added to arrive at a mark. This quantitative method, which is said to be objective and to provide students with a wide range of options, has its origins, according to Judy, in the belief that there is a high correlation between the quantity of writing done by a student and the quality of such writing. / In "contract grading", an agreement is reached between student and teacher as to the amount and quality of work required for a specific grade; the program is designed by the student and approved by the teacher. Judy cautions against forcing this method on the student, though he points out that "contract grading" has the advantages of the "sheer quantity" approach while ensuring some control over quality. Finally, Judy discusses two non-graded systems: pass-fail and the portfolio.

In "The Search for Structure in the Teaching of Composition", Judy further claims that grading destroys the teacher-student relationship. He suggests that no grades at all be placed on particular assignments but a single grade be given for an entire course, that high grades be given because "C" and "D" papers force the teacher into the critic's role, and that students

evaluate themselves on the whole semester or course.

An essay by Herbert Safran (see Geuder et al.) presents a non-grading, quantitative approach in which a student completing at least nine essays is assured an "A" mark. These papers are annotated with questions, which Safran suggests are more effective than comments in leading to improved writing. Safran recommends that papers containing mechanical errors be deemed inadmissible, a practice which could, of course, lead to the rejection of a paper with spelling errors and the acceptance of one with important structural weaknesses.

In "Toward a Non-Graded Program in English Composition", Larson (see Hipple, Readings for Teaching English in Secondary Schools) suggests that organizing composition programs by year levels should cease. He recommends that teachers make a separate determination of their students' progress in composition and then assign them to classes where they will get the instruction and practice required by their specific needs. It is suggested, in fact, that the secondary-school curriculum in composition consist of a sequence of compositions for which the student must develop specified abilities. Larson describes an experimental high-school course in Hawaii consisting of seven sequentially arranged modules each of which take one semester to complete. All modules contain a list of writing assignments with a statement of objectives. It is Larson's opinion that no marks need be given to composition; the student can be rated on literature, language, and

reading skills only.

Variability of Teacher Grading

Apart from the alleged negative effects that grading compositions may have, a major reason for skepticism about the value of this practice is that teachers often differ in their assessment of the same piece of writing. This general lack of uniformity in the grading of compositions is well demonstrated in the factor analysis of judgments of writing ability done by Carlton, French and Diederich (see Diederich) in 1961. This study is described in some detail in Chapter 2 of Measuring Growth in English. Fifty-three "distinguished readers" in six occupational fields graded 300 papers written by college freshmen. These readers included 30 college teachers, ten from each of the three fields of English, social science and natural science. Of the 300 essays graded, 101 received every grade from 1 to 9; no essay receiving less than five different grades. Diederich's analysis of the effect of bias on grading (Chapter 3) is also pertinent to an understanding of variability and inconsistency in grading.

A common cause of variability in evaluating composition is the lack of agreement among English teachers as to the importance of mechanical errors. A study undertaken by Donelson showed that teachers, even when specifically instructed to do so, were unable to avoid taking mechanical errors into account in evaluating a number of compositions.

The Saint Louis Park course in sequential exposition

(see Saint Louis Park Public Schools) contains some useful notes on grading essays. Several of these notes repeat Kitzhaber's comments, on the fallibility of much of the grading done by English teachers. Sample compositions that have been commented upon and graded are included along with an evaluation of the marking itself.

In an article called "Evaluating a Theme", Louise Fitzgerald (see Judine), a teacher, reports on a project in which she elicited responses to a paper she herself had marked. The comments on the paper constitute a disturbing testament to the lack of consistency among teachers in judging the quality of writing.

Burton et al. provide another graphic illustration of the lack of agreement among teachers in marking composition. They present four samples of student writing with a selection of diverse comments by markers. For each sample, these comments range from the laudatory and encouraging to the derogatory and destructive. Similarly, the mark range for each sample is from "A" to "Failure".

This problem of variability in evaluation is addressed by Whitehead, who deals with lack of agreement or uniformity in marking essay-type examinations. He suggests the adoption of Wiseman's "multiple marking" system in which four "self-consistent" markers grade each paper rapidly. The four marks are then totaled, thus lessening individual bias. A reliability of greater than .90 is claimed for this method. Whitehead also notes that the quality of a student's writing

will vary from topic to topic and from genre to genre. This variability is another source of inconsistency of evaluation.

Diederich proposes a remedy which is designed not only to solve the problem of inconsistent grading but also to reduce the amount of marking the teacher needs to do. Diederich says that teachers, not knowing how to judge how much marking is sufficient, actually do too much marking. He claims that "reliability" is the key to this problem, and he devotes a large part of his monograph to a detailed explanation of the concept. His work includes a chapte on "computing the reliability of essay grades" and another on "standard scores for test essays". To evaluate skill in essay writin Diederich advocates that two essays be written on the same day by eac student and that each essay be graded by two teachers. If the grades differ by more than a designated amount, the paper is read by a small committee of "the most experienced teachers who substitute their own grade for whichever of the original grades was farther from their own." If the original marks lie within the agreed tolerance, they are averaged. Diederich claims that, when markers work rapidly and trust their first impressions, the reliability of the grading increases. If, however, standards of writing proficiency are not established before the grading is done, ratings "are less reliable."

Diederich suggests that, if reliable grading can be done by testing at the end of each quarter or semester, grading throughout the year is hardly necessary. In fact, teachers can limit their responses to praise of what the writer has done well, usually

adding no more than one suggestion as to how the writer can improve his next paper. These papers, of course, would receive no grades; otherwise, a teacher might find himself in the untenable position of praising a student's work with only some minor reservation yet having to assign a "D" to the paper.

Diederich also gives details of a system for measuring the amount of improvement attained collectively by students throughout a whole school during one year of a writing program. All students in the school write a paper on the same topic on the same day. Bias is reduced by using numbers instead of names. Each paper is graded by two teachers. Those papers for which the marks deviate by more than one whole grade point are reviewed. Improvement made by the students in the total school writing program can be assessed in various ways. One way is to compare the percentage of students gaining "High," "Middle" and "Low" ratings at each grade level. Diederich explains how to ensure the reliability of evaluation by using appropriate statistical procedures. He also includes important information on interpreting statistics which are used to explain test scores, and he appends a glossary of terms used in evaluation. For an application of the Diederich method to the evaluation of compositions written in an American secondary school, the reader is referred to a dissertation by G.M. Williams. For a thoughtful critique of Diederich's work and an astute discussion of the problem of variability in grading, see Hirsch.

Criteria for Evaluating Composition

Clearly, variations in grading result largely from a lack of agreement among teachers about the properties of effective writing and about the relative importance of each of these properties. This sub-section, while further revealing this lack of agreement, refers to general studies which may be helpful in reducing the divergence of opinion on evaluating writing.

From the "factor analysis" in the study done by Diederich, it was found that "five clusters of readers" were basing their respective ratings on five different factors of writing proficiency. These factors can be summarised as follows: ideas; usage, sentence-structure, punctuation, and spelling; organization and analysis; wording and phrasing; and personal qualities designated as "flavor." The factors were later codified into a set of grading criteria, but Diederich quite rightly disclaims any scientific validity for this codification. His Appendix "E" ("Learning to Write"), in which he sets out 96 factors in composition skill, seems to be a far more promising source of criteria for the English teacher to consider.

A common analysis of writing involves its categorical division into either content and style, or ideas and expression. A careful study of actual writing clearly shows the fallacy of such dichotomies. The better the complexities of "content" are understood, the more difficult it becomes to separate content from form. Lemke denies the usefulness of trying to separate ideas from expression in commenting on student's writing. He

suggests a method of assessing writing based on the degree to which the writing accords with the writer's intention.

In "A Method for Teaching Writing", Elbow suggests that "effectiveness" should be substituted for "truth and style" as the criterion for assessing skill in writing. Writing, he argues, should be designed to produce overt behavior in a reader. A class can therefore be invited to judge writing by its results. It might be asked to consider, for example, whether or not letters written by students are published or invitations accepted. The teacher helps the students to achieve their goals and to discover why some things have worked and some have not. The method seems simple. The class agrees on an assignment, and all papers are duplicated and discussed. If the writer cannot get the class to agree that his writing works, especially if outside validation confirms the class's view, he has not succeeded in the assignment. Elbow thus purports to offer a method for both teaching writing and evaluating it. Unfortunately, he is vague about specific criteria to be applied and even less clear about the connection between his real-world test of effectiveness and the judgment of students based on their own unspecified criteria. A similar system is suggested by Bain, who urges that student writing should be evaluated mainly on how well the writer's purpose is executed.

A more useful application of the pragmatic theory of evaluation is suggested by Peterson in "Evaluating Expository Writing" (see Judine). He puts emphasis on how well the intention implicit in the assignment is carried out by the student. A

discussion of four essays written by students in an average grade-eleven English class begins with an explanation and analysis of the assignment. Each example is then evaluated with regard to its purpose, content, organization, language, reasoning and vigor. Other aspects are also considered, and a rating scale is suggested.

The California Association of Teachers of English (see Judine) offers a tripartite evaluation scale - content, organization, and style and mechanics - which is applied with symbols and comments to five sample compositions ranging from "A" to "D."

In "Marking the Paper", Labrant (see Judine) divides the composition into five parts: ideas, form and structure, meaning and structure, pronoun reference, and spelling. This division, however, has overlapping categories and a lack of proportion among the parts.

A "Joint Statement on Freshman English in College and High School Preparation" - a report prepared by four Indiana Colleges (see Judine) - proposes a list of required abilities for students entering college. Grading standards for freshman composition are based on five criteria: content, organization, sentence-structure, diction, and mechanics. An application of these criteria to actual papers is included.

In "Composition Criteria", Fortner (see Arizona English Bulletin, 16) offers a ten-criteria marking scale in which each criterion has a different point value according to its supposed

relative importance. The total points are added, and a corresponding mark assigned. Fortner asserts that this method provides a check-list for students, improves communication between teacher and student, and reduces the need for marginal annotations by the teacher. While the principle seems to have some merit, Fortner's selection and weighting of criteria are questionable. In any case, it seems doubtful that any grading system which assigns a numerical value to parts of a composition in isolation could provide a reliable basis for evaluating the whole.

In "A Checklist to Improve Writing Papers", Bloom and Wild (see Long) suggest some "searching questions to help students clarify their topic, support it, organize it, avoid mechanical errors, and enhance stylistic effectiveness before the final version." Many of the questions are penetrating and undoubtedly of value. The list, however, is not comprehensive. Moreover, it pertains only to argument (not exposition) and includes some very general questions of little help to the student.

Murray comments upon a number of writing samples. His criteria include specificity, clarity, accuracy, and consistency of point of view. His comments are personal, witty, and conversational. Sometimes he gives up on marking a paper and calls the student to a conference.

In "Grading Compositions", Stone (see Berger and Smith) describes a system of evaluation based on three grades categorizing papers as either excellent, acceptable, or needing rewriting. A paper to be rewritten

initially receives an F or D and is revised until it becomes acceptable, at which time it is awarded a C. There is no limit to the number of times a paper may be rewritten. The advantages and disadvantages of this system are discussed. No specific criteria for establishing the three gradings are suggested.

In "From Guided Theme Reading to Improved Composition Writing", Levine (see Judine) claims that a student must read many compositions written by peers in order to find a realistic comparative norm by which to judge the value of his own writing. Giving three examples, Levine illustrates the reading of themes with specific questions as guides to evaluation. The questions are arranged in three sections: reading for content, organization, and logic; reading to improve techniques of writing; and reading for exact and vivid words. Levine claims that this method stresses thinking, content, organization and logic - elements of writing which he regards as "matters of prime concern. He adds that "knowledge of the rules of writing are obtained inductively, whenever possible." Referring to the artificiality and ineffectiveness of the "linguistic forms and usages" found in language and composition texts, Levine points out the need for an "analysis of hundreds of completed themes". Through such study, forms and usages appropriate to student, as distinct from professional, writing may be learned inductively. He criticizes exercises which treat some isolated fault in writing, claiming that "each element of writing requiring specific instruction

should be based on the actual context of a complete theme rather than on the microscopic specimen of a mistake which pinpoints its own correction when removed from the living organism that is the unedited essay."

In two articles on language, Irwin Berger (see Judine), an "authority on audience reaction to language," enlists semantics in the service of the evaluation of composition. The first article - "Eleven Common Sense Principles About Language" - offers eleven guidelines for semantic conciseness. Berger discusses, among other topics, the difficulty of the meanings of abstract and relative terms; context as a determinant of meaning; different kinds of truth; the hidden emotional content of words; controlling generalizations; and the avoidance of "allness" and "either/or" thinking. In the second article - "Student Writing Examined for Logic and Clarity" - Berger applies some of his semantic principles to the marking of composition in a discussion of six short samples of student writing.

Commenting on Student Writing

In "In Praise of Praise," Diederich (see Judine) claims that positive comments are "the only [ones] that ever do a student any good." A teacher should find as many good points as possible in a composition and then perhaps point out one aspect of writing in which the student should try to improve. If a teacher wishes to be strongly negative in criticizing a sample of writing, he should use one that has been written in a class other than the class

in which the sample is discussed.

According to Judy, in "The Search for Structure in the Teaching of Composition," the traditional responses to student writing have been commentary, criticism, correction, advice, and — "all too occasionally"— encouragement. It is claimed that this approach inhibits students and renders then unable to "give a personal opinion in writing." Judy advocates that teachers respond to students as equals, encourage them to write about their own concerns, and liberate them from the pressure of criticism. He believes that if writing is meaningful to the students, "it is lifted from the level of a formal exercise to that of real communication."

Hillard presents some samples of senior high-school papers, mostly expository, that have been commented on and evaluated. The comments are of two kinds: those originally addressed to the writer of the paper and those written for the reader of the book. Hillard's basic tenets are that evaluation should be constructive and instructive and that comments should be clear, specific, and well organized. Her own comments are critical, detailed, and reliant on the student's knowledge of grammatical terms and rules. She pays attention to ideas, specificity, development, support, and logic.

"A Report: What is Composition at the Ninth Grade Level?" (see Judine) includes three sample student compositions, each followed by a selection of critical comments arranged in two groups: comments worth noting and comments that would be of little

or no help to the student.

Methods of Marking and Grading

(a) Marking by the Teacher

Several writing theorists have argued that not all weaknesses (usually termed "errors") in a given paper should be marked. The teacher's marking burden is thus reduced, and the student is spared discouragement. Loban, Ryan and Squire, for example, suggest that the purpose of teaching writing - to make the student self-critical - is best served by allowing him to discover his own weaknesses. They recommend the use of checksheets, evaluation forms, and graphic charts to identify problems. They also suggest using pupil evaluations or self-evaluations, and grading some sets of papers with other teachers.

Pierson thoughtfully appraises traditional methods of evaluation. Hipple, in Teaching English in Secondary Schools, also evaluates some common practices in grading compositions: grading only what is wrong; grading what has not been taught; overmarking the same error; and assigning two grades to a paper. All of these practices he regards as weaknesses in marking. Hipple also suggests some techniques for improving composition evaluation. These include peer evaluation, cumulative peer evaluation, student-teacher conferences, and what he terms "the scorecard approach." This last technique involves grading only one aspect of the writing in each assignment and teaching about this aspect before the writing is done. He claims six advantages for this

technique and answers two possible objections to it.

Burton et al. discuss four common ways of marking composition: 1) assigning a grade - a practice which is easy for the teacher but worthless for the student; 2) indicating faults - a practice which discourages the student and often causes the teacher to lose touch with what the student is trying to say; 3) correcting - a practice which fails to explain why the erroneous parts are wrong; 4) teaching writing and thinking - a procedure which consists of the teacher's marking a few mechanical problems but transforming most of his comments into questions so as to begin a teacher-student dialogue. The last way of marking is, of course, the one recommended by the authors. The teacher's reactions show that he has read with interest, and they help the student in revising and writing in the future.

A similar method is offered by Dusel (see Judine) in "Some Semantic Implications of Theme Correction." Warning against the use of symbols, he urges the teacher to ask questions about purpose in writing and to limit comments to interested responses to ideas. Mechanical errors, he says, should be noted on separate cards kept by the teacher.

A method of evaluation purporting to place emphasis on learning is suggested in "Criterion-Referenced Grading in English" by Kirk and Dummer (see Berger). A student's writing is evaluated according to the number of pre-established requirements it meets. These requirements consist of the completion of a stipulated number of writing assignments, of which some are

teacher-assigned and others student-selected. No criteria for evaluating the quality of these assignments are mentioned.

In "Some Considerations When Marking," Stratta (see Hipple, Readings for Teaching English in Secondary Schools) discusses certain attitudes, values, and standards which might enable English teachers to resolve current disagreements about methods of grading. He stresses that the teacher should demonstrate a genuine interest in what the student has to say. Warning against "marking each piece of writing against a fixed standard ... concerned in the main with syntactical and spelling accuracy," he suggests that pupils should be taught "to handle the written mode of language flexibly, sensitively, exactly, and fluently, [and] to become increasingly aware of the possibilities of language, its subtleties, power, and limitations." He adds that "in recognizing a pupil's strengths a teacher is not automatically endorsing his limitations." A sympathetic teacher will accept a pupil's present level of achievement as a starting point but "will always desire to raise it in the best possible way." Stratta believes that talking to students individually about their writing "in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect" is probably the most effective procedure. He discusses selective marking. Finally, he points out that writing is not an undifferentiated task and some kinds of writing are more difficult to do than others. Stratta encourages teachers to be aware of the different demands of each writing task and to mark accordingly.

A method of marking compositions, which though weak in

certain details might be of some value for the beginning teacher of English, is a seven-stage system set forth by Rogal. The procedure can be summarized as follows: 1) identify the general purpose by checking that the "writer has a compact but specific sentence summary"; 2) consider the outline by evaluating how the writer has planned the presentation of the material; 3) give the paper a first reading to see if the general purpose and outline have been followed; 4) read the paper a second time to judge the "content" and the extent to which the main idea is developed; 5) read it a third time to check organization, paragraph development, sentence and paragraph transitions, and variety; 6) read it a fourth time to check mechanical accuracy; (7) give the essay a grade with written criticism both positive and negative. Rogal supplies a theme correction chart and a grading and checking list, both of which are open to serious criticism.

A means of giving instruction to a whole group while marking a single composition is presented in "A Magic Lantern For English" by Edwin Peterson (see Judine). He discusses the use of overlays to highlight the particular features of composition skill being presented. Peterson claims that the method saves time, interests students, and facilitates learning. Diederich, however, objects to the use of overhead projection of sample essays, arguing that students cannot take the projection home to edit before the discussion and that one cannot project the whole paper at once. He advocates the use of duplicated copies of sample papers with wide spaces between the lines and ample margins.

(b) "Conferences"

Mullican describes various kinds of classroom conference which can be convened by teachers or students. The possible purposes of these meetings include coaching, dictation by peers, and discussion of such matters as drafts, revisions, problems, and the reactions of peer-auditors. Mullican draws heavily on Moffett, Zoellner and Murray.

Murray's guidelines for the conduct of such meetings can be summarized as follows: conferences should be brief, informal, and occasional; the teacher should try to identify and solve only one writing problem during each conference so there is no need for the pre-reading of compositions; the teacher should concern himself with what has been actually written by a student and not try to act as confessor or psycho-analyst; conferences should be initiated preferably by the student but when necessary by the teacher. Murray suggests that the teacher should first ask the student himself to identify problems and suggest solutions. If the student is unable to respond, the teacher should make suggestions, give out a check-list or model paragraph, or refer the student to relevant pages in a composition text.

Fowler describes a meeting of student and teacher to evaluate a student's writing. A folder of several essays rather than a single essay is assessed by reference to check-list or "Ideaform." The latter item, a cover-sheet available from NCTE, provides an evaluation scale for rating aspects of both form and content. Another discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of this

procedure is provided in "The Conference Evaluation: A Renewal" by Blenski (see Geuder et al.).

Vogler describes his use of a cassette tape-recorder for marking compositions. The students, each having their own cassette tape, number the lines of their essays and hand in the tape with their papers. Vogler includes a transcript of a recorded response to an eighth-grade paragraph. The comments are personal and inspirational. In this method, grading is done after the comments have been made. The article illustrates the amount of detail into which the instructor may go using this system. A similar procedure is described by Ohmann and Coley. They note that the system is time-consuming because of the care with which the papers have to be read if comments are to be helpful. They claim that the method enables the teacher to say more and to say it more clearly than in written marking because there is no need for symbols or abbreviations which commonly lead to ambiguity. Their students liked the method.

(c) Peer-Group Marking

Many teachers of English have for a long time argued that the excessive burden of marking the compositions of 150 to 200 students is an impediment to the effective teaching of composition. This belief found substantial support in a 1956 NCTE Report, which recommended that English teachers should be expected to teach no more than 100 students in four classes during a school year so that their students could get an adequate amount

of instruction and practice in composition. A number of teachers have always suggested, however, that the marking by the teacher of all written work done by their students may be a practice that is both unnecessary and relatively ineffectual. Several articles noted in this subsection discuss the involvement of the students themselves in the process of responding to their own writing and to that of their peers.

Burton et al. urge that students be taught to be constructive and helpful in their responses to the writing of their peers. They claim that students will tend to apply methods and criteria similar to those of their teacher. If the teacher stresses mechanics and errors so will the students; the teacher's positive concern for ideas will be similarly imitated. The implications for the teacher are obvious.

In Explorations in the Teaching of Secondary English, Judy also deals with the question of getting students to take part in the process of assessing their own work. His advice includes the following points: students should be encouraged to talk about their writing problems as they write; they should be able to change the assigned topic at will; they should be left to decide which samples of their writing are to be public and which private; they should be encouraged to act as each other's editors; they should be led to develop criteria for judging the value of writing by putting themselves in the place of the audience; and the teacher should leave proof-reading to the students, especially students with particular editing skills.

Logan, Logan and Paterson describe a peer-evaluation procedure using writing partners and what they call a board of editors. The general method seems sound, but the suggested criteria appear to be arbitrary, incomplete, and undifferentiated. Stanford and Smith also present grading criteria together with some approaches to student evaluation of papers. A bibliography on evaluation is included.

Ohmann and Coley discuss establishing standards according to which peer-group evaluation should be made, and they present a sample standards-form which is to be attached to each paper after it has been marked. Their procedure requires that the student revise his paper in the light of this marking and then confer in his group. For under-achievers, individual conferences with the teacher are arranged twice per semester. The criteria for evaluation are sketchy. The authors outline reasons for the effectiveness of the system.

Hardaway describes a similar peer-evaluation system. Criteria are initially established and a standards-form derived. Four student readers evaluate each paper, assign a grade, and justify it. The student-writer revises the paper; if he disagrees with any part of the evaluation, he calls the evaluators together for a discussion. This oral exchange can clarify possible misunderstandings resulting from the written comments. The teacher responds to requests for information in these conferences but does not evaluate. Several advantages are claimed for this system: the teacher is freed from imposing standards;

students are involved in the grading process, "which ceases to be a mystery looked on with hostility;" they become more conscious of their own errors and of the idea of audience; the teacher, relieved of the duty of having to deal with obvious errors, is left more time to handle more complicated writing problems; more writing can be assigned so that the students get more writing practice. The system is complemented by teacher-student conferences twice per term.

Murray also has some comments on how to reduce the marking of papers by placing the burden of revision on the student. Most papers, he suggests, should not be graded. The teacher should point out one problem in a paper and have the student solve it by rethinking. In discussion, the student can be told that there are a certain number of errors of a certain kind in his paper which he must find and correct for himself. Students can also correct each other's essays, referring the occasional paper to the teacher for editing on an overhead projector.

(d) Other Ways of Reducing the Teacher's Marking Burden

Apart from peer-group marking, a number of other techniques for easing the English teacher's workload have been proposed. Loban, Ryan and Squire suggest that the teacher can save time in evaluation by preparing students for the written assignment with an oral discussion which sparks ideas, clarifies thought and establishes the purpose of the writing. Compositions that are clear and are guided by a definite controlling purpose are easier

to mark and grade. Another approach is pre-correction, which requires two class periods, usually on successive days. The teacher spends the first period moving about the class answering questions and making suggestions. Fifteen minutes before the end of the first period he writes a number of questions on the blackboard to draw the attention of students to possible weaknesses in their papers. The students check their drafts in accordance with these questions and revise their papers at home. Students work on a second draft during the second period and the teacher, as before, moves about answering questions and making suggestions. He again concludes by presenting some new questions on the basis of which the students then prepare their final copies.Loban, Ryan and Squire describe in detail another time-saving variation of peer-group evaluation. What might be termed the nom-de-plume method requires two classes to anonymously exchange papers which are then marked and graded by the students. Yet another suggestion is to have students hand in only what they consider to be the best of three composition assignments.

WORKS CITED

Albert, Burton, Jr. Tips from Tom, Ben and the Other '76-ers: Launching A Writer's Workshop.

Allen, Harold B. Minnesota Colleges Conference on English Teacher Preparation. Final Report.

Anderson, Wallace L. and Norman C. Stageberg. Introductory Readings on Language.

Arena, Louis A. Linguistics and Composition.

Arizona English Bulletin Vols. 15 & 16. The Many Faces of Language.

Bain, Robert. "Reading Student Papers."

Barnet, Sylvan and Marcia Stubbs. Practical Guide to Writing.

Barr, Mary A. About Writing: Strategies for Secondary English Teachers.

Berger, Allen and Blanche Hope Smith. Measure for Measure.

Braddock, Richard. "The Frequency and Placement of Topic Sentences in Expository Prose."

Briscoe, Gail Fisher. "Using Journals with 'Slow' High-School Learners." Arizona English Bulletin, 16.

Britton, James. The Development of Writing Abilities, 11-18.

Brown, Rollo W. How the French Boy Learns to Write.

Brown, Thomas, Mary Gallagher and Rosemary Turner. Teaching Secondary English.

Bruffee, Kenneth A. "Collaborative Learning: Some Practical Models."

Budz, Judith and Terry Grabar. "Tutorial Versus Classroom in Freshman English."

Bullock Report. A Language for Life.

Burke, Virginia. "A Candid Opinion on Lay Readers."

Burns, Paul C., J. Estill Alexander and Arnold R. Davies. Language Arts Concepts for Elementary School Teachers.

Burton, Dwight L. and John S. Simmons. Teaching English in Today's High Schools.

Burton, Dwight L. et al. Teaching English Today.

Caruso, Domenick and Stephen Weidenborner. Creating Contexts.

Centre for Information on the Teaching of English, Edinburgh (Scotland). "English for Young School Leavers."

Clapp, Ouida. Classroom Practices in Teaching English, 1975-76.

Coe, Richard M. "Rhetoric 2001."

Cohen, B. Bernard. Writing About Literature.

Colorado State Department of Education, Denver, Language Arts Advisory Committee. Teaching Composition. Suggestions for the Teacher, Kindergarten Through College.

Corbett, Edward P.J. Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student.

Crabbe, Katharyn. "Debate/Write - An Approach to Writing Arguments: Staffroom Interchange."

Crews, Frederick. The Random House Handbook.

Croll, Morris William. Style, rhetoric, and rhythm; essays.

D'Angelo, Frank. "New and Renewed Rhetorics: Implication for Teaching."

Dauterman, Philip. The Teaching of Composition: Rhetorical Perspectives.

Dean, Leonard F. and K. Wilson, eds. Essays on Language and Usage.

Dean, Leonard F., Walker Gibson and K. Wilson, eds. The Play of Language.

Diederich, Paul B. Measuring Growth in English.

Donelson, Kenneth L., ed. "Research and Experiments in English Teaching."

Donaldson, Margaret. Children's Minds.

Dudenhefer, John Paul, Jr. An Experimental Study of Two Techniques of Composition Revision in a Developmental English Course for Technical Students. (See American Dissertations)

Elbow, Peter. "A Method for Teaching Writing."

Elbow, Peter. Writing Without Teachers.

Elcan, Ruth V. Elements of College Writing.

Flesch, Rudolf. Say What You Mean.

Fowler, Mary Elizabeth. Teaching Language, Composition and Literature.

Gehle, Quentin L. and Duncan J. Rollo. The Writing Process. (See Canadian Monographs)

Geuder, Patricia et al, eds. They Really Taught Us How to Write.

Gleason, H.A., Jr. Linguistics and English Grammar.

Gleason, H.A., Jr. "What Grammar."

Gold, Joseph, ed. In the Name of Language.

Golub, Jeffrey N. and Robert W. Reising. "Oral Communication as Pre-Writing Actvities."

Goodenough, Warwick. "Short Essay Writing Courses at Tertiary Level." (See British Periodical Articles)

Gorrell, Robert M., ed. Rhetoric - Theories for Application, Papers Presented at the 1965 Convention of the National Council of Teachers of English.

Grady, Michael. "On Teaching Christensen Rhetoric."

Graham, Robert M. Alternative Strategy in English Classrooms.

Graves, Richard L. Rhetoric and Composition: A Sourcebook for Teachers.

Gurrey, Percival. Teaching English Grammar.

Gurrey, Percival. Teaching the Mother Tongue in Secondary Schools.

Gurrey, Percival. The Teaching of Written English.

Hardaway, Francine. "What Students Can Do to Take the Burden Off."

Hawkins, Thom. Group Inquiry Techniques for Teaching Writing.

Hawley, Robert C. and Isabel L. Hawley. Writing for the Fun of It.

Hayakawa, S.I. Language in Thought and Action.

Hillard, Helen. Suggestions for Evaluating Senior High School Writing.

Hipple, Theodore W. Readings for Teaching English in Secondary Scholls.

Hipple, Theodore W. Teaching English in Secondary Schools.

Hirsch, E.D., Jr. The Philosophy of Composition.

Judine, Sister M. ed. A Guide for Evaluating Student Composition.

Judy, Stephen. "The Search for Structure in the Teaching of Composition."

Judy, Stephen, ed. Lecture Alternatives in Teaching English.

Judy, Stephen N. Explorations in the Teaching of Secondary English.

Kohl, Herbert R. The Open Classroom.

Kinneavy, James L., John Cope and J.W. Campbell. Aims and Audience in Writing.

Kitzhaber, Albert R. A Sequential Curriculum in Language, Reading, and Composition (Oral and Written), Grades 7 Through 12. Final Report. 1967. Oregon Curriculum Study Centre.

Kitzhaber, Albert R. Themes, Theories, and Therapy. The Teaching of Writing in College. The Report of the Dartmouth Study of Student Writing. 1963.

Lamb, Catherine E. Needed: A Theory of Instruction in the Art of Invention.

Larson, Richard L., comp. "Selected Bibliography of Research and Writing About the Teaching of Composition, 1973 and 1974."

Larson, Richard L., comp. "Selected Bibliography of Research and Writing About the Teaching of Composition, 1975."

Larson, Richard L., ed. Children and Writing in the Elementary School.

Lemke, Alan K. "Writing as Action in Living."

Loban, Walter, Margaret Ryan and James Squire. Teaching Language and Literature.

Logan, Lillian, Virgil Logan and Leona Paterson. Creative Communication. (See Canadian Monographs, Reports and Papers)

Long, Littleton, ed. Writing Exercises from "Exercise Exchange".

Los Angeles City Schools, California, Division of Instructional Planning and Services. On the Ball-Point: Classroom Practices in Teaching Composition.

Luria, A.R. Basic Problems of Neurolinguistics.

Mader, Thomas F. "On Presence in Rhetoric."

Marder, Daniel. "The Spectrum of Rhetoric."

Martin, Nancy et al. Writing and Learning Across the Curriculum, 11-16.

McCrimmon, James. Writing with a Purpose.

Mellon, John C. Transformational Sentence-Combining.

Mellon, John C. National Assessment and the Teaching of English. 1975.

Mills, Glen E. Reason in Controversy.

Moffett, James. Teaching the Universe of Discourse.

Moffett, James. A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum, K-13.

Mullican, James S., ed. "Focus on Composition."

Murray, Donald M. A Writer Teaches Writing.

"National Council of Teachers of English." Ad Hoc Committee on Grading. Policy on Grading.

Obenchain, Anne. "Effectiveness of the Precise Essay Question in Programming the Sequential Development of Written Composition Skills."

Obenchain, Anne. "Developing Paragraph Power Through Sentence Combining."

Obenchain, Anne. Links to Forceful Writing.

O'Hare, Frank. Sentence-Combining.

Ohmann, Richard and W.B. Coley, eds. Ideas for English 101.

Ong, Walter. "The Writer's Audience is Always a Fiction."

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, English Study Committee. Rhetoric: A Unified Approach to English Curricula.

Petty, Walter T., Dorothy C. Petty and Marjorie F. Becking. Experiences in Language.

Pierson, Howard. Teaching Writing.

Redd, Virginia P. From the Concrete to the Abstract: Making

Writing Concepts Real for the Middle School Student (A Demonstration of Teaching Strategies.

Rice, Frank M. English and its Teaching.

Roberts, Edgar V. Writing Themes about Literature.

Rogal, Samuel J. Teaching Composition in the Senior High School.

Saint Louis Park Public Schools, Minnesota. A Source in Sequential Exposition: Grades 10-12.

Sherwin, J. Stephen. Four Problems in Teaching English: A Critique of Research.

Shugrue, Michael F., and George Hillocks, Jr. Patterns and Models for Teaching English - 1964.

Shuman, R. Baird, ed. Creative Approaches to the Teaching of English.

Simon, Sidney B., Robert C. Hawley and David D. Britton. Composition for Personal Growth: Values Clarification Through Writing.

Stanford, Gene and Marie Smith. A Guidebook for Teaching Composition.

Steward, Joyce S. "To Like to Have Written: Learning and Laboratory Way."

Stewart, Donald C. The Authentic Voice.

Stewart, Donald, ed. "Composition, Culture, Citizenship."

Stewart, Donald C. "Stand up and Cheer for Grubby Prose."

Stotsky, Sandra L. "Sentence-Combining as a Curricular Activity: Its Effect on Written Language Development and Reading Comprehension."

Strong, William. Sentence Combining.

Tate, Gary. Teaching Composition.

Tate, Gary and Edward P. Corbett. Teaching High School Composition.

Tiedt, Iris M. Individualizing Writing in Elementary Classroom.

Tierney, Gilbert and Stephen N. Judy. "The Assignment Makers."

Trosky, O.S. and C.C. Wood. "Nobody Writes A Paragraph."

Vygotsky, L.S. Thought and Language.

Vogler, Stephen H. "Grading Themes: A New Approach; A New Dimension."

Waldschmidt, Elmer C. "Peers Paired for Talk-Writing."

Wallace, Karl R. "Towards a Rationale for Teachers of Writing and Speaking."

Whitehead, Frank. The Disappearing Dais. (See British Monographs)

Williams, G.M. "An Evaluation of the Writing Performance of Students in Grades Seven Through Ten in an Urban Junior-Senior High School Using the Diederich Method of Cooperative Composition Rating. (See American Dissertations)

Williams, Jeanette T. Learning to Write or Writing to Learn?

Williams, Joseph M. The New English.

Winterowd, W. Ross. Contemporary Rhetoric.

Young, Richard E. and Frank M. Koen. The Tagmemic Discovery Procedure. An Evaluation of its Uses in the Teaching of Rhetoric.

Young, Richard E., Alton L. Becker and Kenneth L. Pike. Rhetoric: Discovery and Change.

Zoellner, Robert. "Talk-Write: A Behavioral Pedagogy for Composition."

CHAPTER 3

COMPOSITION TEXTS

by

A.M. Beattie and A.D. McLay

This chapter reviews composition texts which are currently in use in English classes at the Intermediate and at the Senior level. The selection is based upon the Ministry of Education Circular 14 listing of texts but does not include those texts which were not readily available and those which were not pertinent to our inquiry.

At the Intermediate level, teachers have a wide choice among various individual texts and series aimed specifically at grades seven to ten. Some of these texts have been in print for fifteen years or longer and are traditional in method and format, whereas others of more recent publication introduce innovative methods of teaching that make use of oral and visual incitements. All the texts have adopted, some in orderly sequence and some haphazardly, what is frequently termed the "functional" approach to grammar: that is, grammar not as a separate, scheduled subject but in ad hoc application to problems that arise from writing assignments. All the texts stress the importance of personal and "creative" writing, especially at the beginning levels. There is ample variety in the choice of texts intended for classes at these stages and aimed at the tastes of a considerable diversity

of teachers. The following comments deal with the texts according to dates of publication.

The Craft of Writing by R.J. McMaster (Longman, 1962) introduces students at the grade-nine level to the fundamental forms and techniques of writing, presented under the headings of narration, description, exposition. There are sections devoted to unity, coherence, emphasis. The pedagogical approach is thoroughly traditional, particularly in the use of model sentences and paragraphs for study and emulation. Grammar is not presented systematically, but each chapter has a section on specific problems complete with useful exercises. Useful guides to the conventions of spelling and punctuation are also included in each chapter. Writing assignments are frequent but tend to be unimaginative and unexciting.

The Expression of Thought by R.J. McMaster and W.C. McMaster (Longman, 1963), which is similar in format but more advanced, for grade-ten students, stresses the process of thinking as well as the expression of thought. Individual chapters discuss word-usage, sentence-structure, paragraph-development, and approaches to writing. The Probing of Experience by the same authors (Longman, 1969) is intended for younger students, in grades seven or eight. It aims at consolidating what the pupils have learned in earlier grades and at introducing them to a more systematic study of language as an instrument of communication. Although sample passages, questions, and exercises are similar in content and method to those in the companion texts, an attempt

has been made to utilise such visual stimuli as pictures and photographs; this is an element that is, unfortunately, missing in the other books. Older teachers might continue to find these texts useful in the classroom, but younger teachers and students are likely to consider them rather drab in appearance and outdated in teaching methods.

Still another text by the same authors is Creative Composition (Longman, 1963), a two-year program of composition classes at the levels of grades nine and ten. It is similar in content and method to the texts mentioned above, even using some of the same sample passages and assignments. Chapters are devoted to parts of speech, sentence structure, punctuation, logical development of thought, and essay organization. Grammatical structures are presented in a more systematic and organized fashion. The text shares some of the virtues - clarity and conciseness - and some of the defects - dullness and lack of inspiration - with the texts already mentioned.

Another of the older series is Language Comes Alive. Each of these books presents selections of prose and verse with questions for discussion and writing assignments based broadly on the models. The books are attractive in appearance, with line illustrations and interesting, though somewhat dated, selection of materials. Language Comes Alive 7 by F.L. Carver and K. Mead Elliott (Dent, 1961) stresses creative writing, narration, and description. Language Comes Alive 8 by the same authors (Dent, 1965) introduces more objective kinds of writing, particularly

exposition and persuasion. Language Comes Alive 9 by John E. Smallbridge (Dent, 196?) is largely a review of the materials that have been presented in the earlier volumes. In these books the approach to grammar is functional, grammatical terms being introduced as they are judged to be relevant. The essentials of word-usage, sentence-construction, paragraph-development, and the stages of writing are presented in an orderly and comprehensive fashion which seems suited to the respective age levels, though there is no evidence that any systematic attempt has been made to determine these. This series might continue to prove serviceable in classes at the levels indicated by the titles, possibly as supplements to more recently published texts.

In Your Own Words 1 (Clarke Irwin, 1965) and In Your Own Words 2 (Clarke Irwin, 1966) by Nathan Davidson and Eleanor Robertson offer a two-year program for Grade seven and eight students. These texts are designed to stimulate creative writing by the study of sample passages and writing assignments based on the models. The chapters are focussed on topics such as home, family, pets, or careers rather than the traditional divisions into narration, description and exposition. Much attention is given to such narrative modes as myth, fable, tales of heroes, and short stories. No formal instruction in grammar is included, but in each chapter a section called "The Writer's Tools" offers useful practical guidance on topics such as variety in sentences, paragraph structure, and levels of usage. Assignments are intended to stimulate personal, imaginative writing appropriate

to the age level. Simple line illustrations and the occasional photograph give this series an attractive format.

English Through Experience by G.A. Nelson and N.E. Nelson (Copp Clark, 1968) was written for British Columbia students aged 12 to 15, but in Ontario it is perhaps most suitable for grades seven and eight. It is not part of a series. The reading selections are more varied and more mature than in the texts already discussed. Little is provided in the way of grammar instruction. Writing assignments stress creative writing based on personal experience and observation; expository writing is not included. Illustrations and photographs are provided to stimulate ideas for writing, and some group projects are suggested. This text is valuable for its interesting selection of reading material and for its encouragement of narrative and descriptive writing, but for teaching modes of exposition other composition texts would be required.

Creative English, Grade 8 by M.C. Roe (Copp Clark, 1968) is the only book in this series which was available. It follows the same basic method of presentation as in the other series which have been examined. Selected readings are provided as a basis for questions and discussion, followed by exercises and assignments in writing. Topics for writing are also suggested by the liberal provision of pictures and photographs. Although grammar is not taught in a formal way, suggested lessons are included in the Teacher's Guide. Chapters on narration and description are included, but more emphasis is placed on training

students in the skills of expository writing which they will need to know both in school and in life. This text provides a broader and more balanced coverage of the various kinds of writing than English Through Experience.

More recent and more ambitious is the Action English series by Emma E. Plattor, Eunice Lawrence, Michael Roe, and James B. Bell (Gage, 1973), a series of four volumes designed for grades seven to ten. The authors, clearly familiar with modern theories of language and writing, provide a coherent and well-designed program for teaching composition at the Intermediate level. Action English 1 and Action English 2 concentrate exclusively on narrative and descriptive modes of writing based on personal experience. Volumes 3 and 4 introduce topics requiring the expression of opinion, argument, or persuasion. Much attention is given to oral as well as written assignments, such as interviews, reports, documentaries, radio and TV programmes, often as group projects. All four books provide a sometimes bewildering variety of visual stimuli - cartoons, advertisements, photographs, films, etc. - which are aimed at arousing the student's interest and inviting him to participate in lively, imaginative projects to the neglect of more traditional assignments which require careful thought and reflection. Formal instruction in grammar is not included, although practical assistance on topics such as word usage, parts of speech, or variety of style is provided in each chapter. Teachers using this series will want to supplement the texts with a more

traditional composition handbook.

Another recent series which has adopted the McLuhan approach is Language Is, Language Lives, Language Matters, and Language Moves by R.T. Shephard, A.C. Coman, and J. Henderson (Nelson, 1971-75). These diverting and colourful books, aimed at establishing rapport with young students who live in close touch with television, advertising, and movies, make excellent use of pictorial material, although so trendily that some pictures already look dated. The primary emphasis in this series also is placed on language, especially with reference to contemporary Canadian usage. The explanations, based on modern linguistic theory, are presented in a light, witty manner which is both entertaining and enlightening. Many of the writing assignments are of a journalistic nature. Instruction in the art of composition is, by conventional standards, given in a fragmented and staccato sequence. The student may well be left with only bits and pieces of information and consequent lack of direction. In the same series, Grammar Is (Nelson, 1974) introduces students to modern theory and usage in a lively and interesting manner. Grammatical terms and concepts are explained in clear, non-technical language with copious use of illustrations drawn from cartoons, advertisements, films, and newspapers. Chapters on parts of speech, problems in usage, sentence structure, sentence combining, and paragraph organization are useful and instructive. This text is designed to be used with the Language Lives series but could be used just as effectively with the Action

English series.

Teachers in sympathy with the techniques and approaches to writing promoted in the last two series will undoubtedly find much to stimulate and inspire a cooperative class. The strength of these texts lies in their constant attention to language, levels of usage, appropriateness, the concern for description rather than prescription, and distortions of language, which should quicken the interest of willing students and make them more aware of the subtleties of language and patterns of speech. There is a danger, however, of alienating the thoughtful student, overstimulating the stupid, and turning the rest of the class into the kind of journalists who would describe these books as "feisty." These series, in short, expose students to only a few limited aspects of a large subject.

Teachers of composition at the Senior level, grades eleven to thirteen, are faced with less variety in the texts currently listed in Circular 14 and with a small number of choices. A more noteworthy deficiency is that among the composition texts prescribed for use in Ontario schools few show any awareness of the immense range of theory and investigation outlined in the literature review, the abstracts and the bibliography of this report. Some teachers of senior classes have expressed dissatisfaction with texts that have been derived only from classroom experience and previous texts, rather than from a coherent philosophy of grammar and rhetoric.

An example of the prevalent sort of eclectic and pragmatic

text is A Handbook of Composition by Douglas M. Brown (Clarke, Irwin, 1953, rev. 1976), a rationally organized, thorough, usable, and somewhat superficial presentation of the various kinds of writing: narration, description, exposition, the report, the précis. The student is well served by numerous exercises in writing, vocabulary-building, and sentence-reconstruction, and by frequent well-chosen examples, a fair number of them drawn from student writing. The book seems aimed at the standards and scope of the former "departmental" or grade-thirteen examination in composition.

Less satisfactory as a whole is Techniques of Good Writing by Margaret L. Ford (Book Society, 1960). This text is strongest in its three full-bodied, well-organized sections on exposition, alternated with chapters on improvement of style. A section on argument and a long section on description are less rewarding. Chapters on literary criticism and on narrative writing are too slight, although here and there a receptive student might pick up valuable hints or suggestions for later investigation. Possibly too many of the examples are drawn from writing by students and by journalists and essayists of minor powers. The strength of the book resides in the first half, devoted to a conventional but useful treatment of expository writing.

Also thoroughly typical of the methods of teaching composition used in Ontario prior to 1967 is Writers' Workshop by Margaret L. Ford and Brian Meeson (Book Society, 1966). Unfortunately, a congested format makes for an unexhilarating

text. The method is the use of examples, most of them astutely selected, on which well-framed questions are based. Interspersed are lessons on various aspects of composition, and assignments by which the student is invited to demonstrate his grasp of model and precept. The examples and exercises are grouped in three substantial sections, headed Narration, Exposition, Argument and Persuasion, followed by a cluster of additional exemplary selections and a chapter on precis-writing. A serviceable year's work in senior composition could be centred on this text by a lively and discerning teacher.

Another example of the standard text is Learning to Write by E.H. Winter and Reed Smith (Macmillan, 1961), a revision of an earlier version. The approach to grammar is thoroughly traditional in the analysis and parsing of sentences and the parts of speech. The first chapter, on fundamentals, provides a convenient review of grammar according to traditional principles. Sections on rules of punctuation and spelling are also useful for reference. A section concerning the history of the language is informative though not integral. Of some value still are the chapters on paragraphing, sentence-structure, word-usage, figurative language, and on various forms of writing: letters, reports, book-reviews, short stories, on description, argument, and the personal essay. This text would serve as a handy reference book that might appeal to teachers trained in pre-seventies years, but many younger teachers would consider it old-fashioned and unreasonable.

Learning Language by Phillip G. Penner and Ruth E. McConnell (Macmillan, 1977) is also a revision of an earlier text, Learning English (1963). The authors are much more aware of recent theories of language and learning. Their approach is student-centred and aims at increasing the student's sensitivity and enriching his oral and visual experience through sensuous stimulation. It is assumed that this approach will make him a better writer. The book includes chapters on the history of the language, Canadian and regional speech, word-usage, sentence-structure, paragraph-development, kinds of writing, and a review of grammar. The material resembles that of Learning to Write, but the presentation is more lively, the format more attractive, the theoretical approach more coherent.

More limited in scope is A Choice of Words by David King and Thomas Crerar (Oxford, 1969), which concentrates on the selection of appropriate words according to context, level of usage, and audience. Sample passages afford opportunities for stimulating discussion of words and their meanings, implications, suitability, liveliness, and usage. Instructions are clear and questions are provocative. The book is designed for use by advanced students, in grades twelve and thirteen, without direct supervision of a teacher.

Four Approaches to Prose by Alan Lawe (Macmillan of Canada, 1971) deploys its material in the traditional textbook fashion. Narration and Exposition are emphasized, with a minimum of explanation and a maximum of examples and exercises. The second

section of the book is devoted to "A Variety of Structures" - i.e., first-person narration, short story, news report, essays of diverse kinds, argument. Again, models are extensively and intelligently used and numerous exercises proposed. Section three, "A Variety of Styles," finds its chief focus in appropriateness of usage rather than in conventions and rules. The "gallery of styles" includes the clear, direct style, the colloquial, the rhetorical, the erudite, the ironic, the mock-heroic, the breezy, and is accompanied by a "realistic" story, a "contrived" story, and a "sophisticated" story. The fourth and final section handles the use of source materials; a salutary distinction is made clear between plagiarism and research. But the anthology of examples of source material, although relevant and intelligently selected, would likely suggest the sort of essay that is lamentably too common: a compilation of data and ideas selected from a broad range of writings but devoid of individuality of judgement or expression. A discreet teacher, however, could put Four Approaches to Prose to excellent use in classes being prepared for university admission.

Language and Expression: A Modern Approach by Don Gutteridge (McClelland and Stewart, 1970) is more mind-stretching than the texts that have been considered above. The author is evidently familiar with current research into the relation between linguistics and conventional grammar-instruction and between rhetoric and the teaching of composition. But the book is not

radical in any thorough-going way. It is of the same lineage as the other texts but brought up to date: a contemporary approach to composition-teaching, which is sane, sweet-tempered, and stimulating. The author is concerned that the student should be motivated, that he should decide for himself what his audience is and determine the mode of writing that will best achieve his purpose. The author is faithful to his own principles; an admirable relationship is brought about with the student and the teacher who together may make use of this text. Five basic modes ("rather than genres") are distinguished in what the opening chapter terms "the rhetorical approach." A later chapter is concerned with "Mixed Modes and the New Rhetoric." Thus the author sets his presentation in the contemporary context. He also draws on various popular forms or modes, those presumed to be the centre of student attention. He illustrates and enlarges with paintings and photographs. He consistently follows the workshop method of assignment and discussion, placing emphasis always on audience and tone, and insisting that effectiveness and suitability are more helpful criteria than "correctness." An Appendix, however, covers parts of speech, sentence-structure, punctuation, and vocabulary. A friendly, attractive vade-mecum - Brown's Handbook brought up to date and made "relevant."

From this review of the composition texts currently in use in the Intermediate and Senior levels of the School system in the Province of Ontario, it is apparent that teachers at the Intermediate level are reasonably well served by the variety and

range of texts to choose from. Senior level teachers, however, face a paucity of good texts in the field of composition. Best of the available composition texts is Gutteridge's Language and Expression: A Modern Approach which for some inexplicable reason is not even mentioned in the Circular 14 list. Also recommended are Dawe's Four Approaches to Prose for use at the Grade 13 level and Learning Language by Penner and McConnell at the Grade 11 and 12 level. It is obvious that the Circular 14 list will have to be drastically revised to bring the list into line with the recent publication of the English Curriculum Guideline for the Senior Division, 1977. There is clearly a need for a new composition text based on modern linguistic principles and providing clear definitions and exercises suitable for students in Grade 13 to replace Mastering Effective English (still in surreptitious use) or American texts such as Baker's The Practical Stylist. Teachers, faced with the responsibility for following the new guidelines concerning the percentage of time to be spent on language and composition in the Senior grades, are not adequately provided with the textbook resources to teach these areas effectively.

Recommendation

It is recommended, therefore, that the Ministry provide financial encouragement and support for the production of new textbooks in this vital area.

CHAPTER 4

TEACHING COMPOSITION: SOME CURRENT RESEARCH AND PRACTICES IN CANADA AND ABROAD

by

James Steele

INTRODUCTION

There is no organization in Canada which systematically registers current research and practices related to methods of teaching composition in the mother tongue. Consequently, the information in this chapter has been gathered through direct inquiries to teachers, administrators, and researchers in many jurisdictions. Although answers were not received from every quarter, many correspondents generously provided both a wealth of printed material (which is now on open file in the Department of English at Carleton University) and thoughtful and informative responses to particular questions. Our correspondents in New Zealand and Scotland have been especially helpful in both respects. The material presented below is a selection in summary form of information thus received. The principle governing the selection has been the potential or possible interest of information to teachers and researchers in the Ontario system.

Listed below are the countries and authorities to whom letters-of-inquiry were sent for referral to knowledgeable respondents:

Australia

1. The Minister of Education in each state

Canada

1. The Dean of each anglophone Faculty of Education outside Ontario.
2. The Minister of Education in each province
3. The chief executive officers of all appropriate professional and research organizations listed in the 1977 Directory of the Canadian Education Association
4. The Canadian Council of Teachers of English and the Ontario Council of Teachers of English

New Zealand

1. The Director-General of Education

United States

1. The U.S. Office of Education, Health and Welfare, Washington, D.C.
2. The Superintendents of Education in each state

United Kingdom

(i) England and Wales	1. The Minister of Education 2. Certain correspondents recommended by the British Council
(ii) Scotland	1. The Director of the Centre for Information on the Teaching of English (Edinburgh)

Other Anglophone Countries

Inquiries were sent to the ministers of education in the Bahamas, Barbados, Guyana, Ireland, Jamaica, and Rhodesia.

Non-Anglophone Countries

(i) Western Europe

Inquiries were directed to the following countries: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, France, Iceland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland. In each instance, the inquiry was sent to the appropriate national agency listed by the Council of Europe's Documentation Centre for Education in Europe in its 1968 publication, European Survey on the Educational Documentation and Information System in 1967.

(ii) Eastern Europe

Letters-of-inquiry were sent to Bulgaria, Poland, the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia through the courtesy of those countries' embassies in Ottawa.

In letters to authorities listed above, information was requested with respect to the following matters, although not all correspondents were asked to comment on all topics:

1. Recently completed and/or current research on methods of teaching composition (including bibliographical studies)
2. Pre-service courses in Canada for the specialized

training of teachers of composition

3. In-service courses in North America for practising teachers of composition
4. Methods and techniques recommended by educational authorities for the teaching of composition

Responses concerning the last point frequently took the form of curricular guidelines and syllabi, which were received from the following jurisdictions: Australia (Western Australia, Queensland); Canada (Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, P.E.I.); New Zealand; United States (Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, Connecticut, Iowa, Louisiana, North Carolina, Ohio, Washington). Information concerning methods of testing the writing abilities of high school students was also received from Florida, Maryland, and Georgia.

It should be noted that there were no responses from several non-Anglophone countries to which inquiries were addressed. This group included France and the U.S.S.R., two countries reputed to have developed unique methods of teaching composition. A description of the traditional French method may be found, however, in Rollo Walter Brown, How the French boy learns to write; a study in the teaching of the mother tongue and in two Ministry of Education curriculum guides: Classes de sixième et cinquième (Centre national de documentation pédagogique, 1977) pp. 11-45; and Le premier cycle (Institut national de recherche et de documentation pédagogiques, 1976), passim. For discussions of more recent developments in France, four periodicals are

especially pertinent: Le Français Aujourd'hui (published by the Association Française des Enseignants de Français de la Maternelle à l'Université); Langue Française (Larousse); Pratique (A. Petitjean, Metz); and Reteres. (The last named periodical is held in the Library of the University of Montreal.)

A survey of Soviet experiences and research in teaching the mother-tongue is to be found in A.V. Tekuchev's "Major Landmarks in the History of the Development of Soviet Methodology in the Teaching of the Russian Language in the Secondary School (1917-1967)" in Soviet Education X, No. 7 (May, 1968), pp. 3-37. For related work in language study at the primary level, see N.S. Rozhdestvenskii, "Composition and Structure of the Russian Language Syllabus," in Soviet Education X, No. 2 (Dec. 1967), pp. 3-11; N.A. Menchinskaia, "Fifty Years of the Soviet Psychology of Learning," Soviet Education X, No. 6 (April 1968), pp. 3-18; and Arthur S. Trace, Jr. What Ivan Knows That Johnny Doesn't (New York, 1961). A summary American description of the place of the mother-tongue in the Soviet curriculum may be found in the Division of International Education: International Educational Relations Branch, Education in the U.S.S.R. (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare: Bulletin 1957, No. 14), pp. 67-73. The training of teachers is discussed briefly in Soviet Commitment to Education: Report of the First Official U.S. Education Mission to the U.S.S.R. (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare: Bulletin 1959, No. 16), pp. 85-97.

The information in this chapter is divided into three PARTS, each organized differently, and a CONCLUSION. PART I consists of three sections which identify respectively (A) some recently completed and current research on methods of teaching composition, (B) some pre-service courses offered at Canadian institutions for the specialized training of teachers of composition and (C) some North American in-service programs for practising teachers of composition. Within each section, information is listed according to its country-of-origin; and, for each item, an identifying name, institution, and topical description have been cited. Researchers and teachers seeking further information about any particular item should correspond directly with the appropriate investigator or instructor.

PART II consists of two articles relating to the California Writing Project, which is a program for in-service training and practical research. The first article, by George F. Nemetz, describes the organizational history of the Project. The second is a Project statement on "the state of knowledge about written composition." Both documents were written by persons closely associated with the Project and should be of interest to teachers and researchers as well as to designers of in-service programs.

PART III consists of two sections describing aspects of the training of teachers of composition in (A) New Zealand and (B) Scotland, two countries whose educational systems are

reputed to achieve excellent results. No comparisons, however, are made with the Ontario system, and knowledgeable readers must draw their own conclusions as to the potential usefulness of the ideas and practices described.

The CONCLUSION of this chapter is accordingly limited to a presentation of four recommendations suggested by certain foreign practices that seem especially promising. Each recommendation is explained by a brief indication of its relevance to Ontario.

PART I

CURRENT RESEARCH, SPECIALIZED COURSES AND IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS

A. CURRENT RESEARCH

(i) AUSTRALIA

Investigator: Jonathan Cook

Institution: Department of Education, State of Western Australia, Perth, Australia

Topic: "Language and Learning Project." This project is based on action research at the school and classroom levels. Its principal aims and functions are as follows: (a) to examine the role of language in West Australian schools, across the curriculum and from kindergarden to grade 12, through investigations by teachers of various aspects of language and learning in special classroom contexts; (b) to disseminate the results of research on the relationship between language and learning.

Investigator: C.T.P. Diamond

Institution: University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

Topic: "The Relative Effect of Teacher Cognitions and Student Characteristics on Writing Performance," (Ph.D. thesis, University of Queensland, 1977). This study examines the contributions of teacher and student variables to achievement in, and attitudes towards, writing. Ninety-three teachers of grade-ten English and 372 grade-ten pupils were involved in the investigations. The results showed that twenty nuclear categories exist among teacher cognitions regarding the teaching of writing, which cluster into seven well differentiated groups of viewpoints. The major differences in teachers' cognitions were shown not to result in disparate pupil progress: the classes' mean growth in writing was either arrested or retarded. Variables relating to teacher characteristics and teaching techniques affected two of the attitudes but not achievement. Variables relating to prior writing achievement, reading materials in the home, sex, introversion-extroversion, voluntary reading and writing, and reading ability affected both attitudes and achievement. The interpretation of the results focuses on the teachers' failure to tap the intentions of the students and to provide appropriate feedback. The current model of teaching

writing so widely practised is shown to be unsuccessful. Six suggestions for implementing an alternative model are offered. [The foregoing description is a summary of the investigator's abstract.]

Investigator: D.F. Davis et al.

Institution: Faculty of Education, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria, Australia 3168

Topic: A descriptive survey of teacher education with special reference to English, Language Arts and English Methodology. The survey includes every teacher-training institution in Australia and a small comparative sample of institutions in overseas countries. (This study is being carried out by the Australian Government's National Committee on English Teaching.)

(ii) CANADA

Investigators: Y. Begin et al.

Institution: Institut National de la Recherche Scientifique: Centre d'Education, 2383 Chemin Ste. Foy, Québec, P.Q.

Topic: Programme SAGE (Système d'Apprentissage Géré par l'Etudiant). Ce programme de recherche vise à

individualiser l'enseignement pour le second cycle de l'élémentaire.

Investigator: Roy Bentley

Institution: Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.

Topic: A study of the preparation in Canada of teachers of English, Language Arts and Reading and of the preparation of teachers of other subjects in English and Reading.

Investigators: Carl Bereiter, et al.

Institution: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario.

Topic: "The Development of a Pedagogy of Writing." The investigators note that this project has the "dual purposes of (a) developing a curriculum for improving expository writing skills and (b) studying the mental processes involved in writing."

Investigator: Gilles Bibeau

Institution: Faculté des Sciences de l'Education, Université de Montréal, 265 ave. Mount Royal O., Montréal, Québec

Topic: Inventaire de projets de recherche et d'expé-

rience pédagogiques en français d'écoles secondaires de la région de Montréal (1970-1977)

Investigator: Patrick Dias, et al.

Institution: Department of Education in English, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec

Topic: A writing program for secondary schools. A preliminary draft of several units to be used at the Secondary I (Grade 7) level has been completed. The investigator has also prepared related modules for study by teachers-in-training.

Investigators: Jean-Marc Dumas and Georgette Blais

Institution: Institut National de la Recherche Scientifique: Centre d'Education, 2383 Chemin Ste. Foy, Québec, P.Q.

Topic: "Répertoire des écrits de l'INRS-Education." This bibliography, which lists several items on the teaching of French as a mother tongue, may be obtained from the INRS's Service de Liaison.

Investigator: M. Dwane-Durand

Institution: Université du Québec à Trois Rivières

Topic: La stratégie du jeu dans la didactique du français.

Investigator: Gilles Dussault et al.

Institution: Institut National de la Recherche Scientifique: Centre d'Education, 2383 Chemin Ste. Foy, Québec, P.Q.

Topic: Curriculum: français, langue maternelle (développement de programmes de français coordonnés pour les niveaux élémentaire et secondaire).

Etude clinique de l'enseignement du français, langue maternelle, au niveau secondaire (1973-76): Rapport Final. (INRS-Education, 1977).

Investigator: Peter J.A. Evans

Institution: Midnorthern Field Centre, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Sudbury, Ontario

Topic: A Senior Elementary Writing Evaluation Project. This Project is designed to develop a planned writing program for grades 7 and 8 and methods of evaluation that relate effectively to that program. The Project has involved the evaluation of the writing of some 8,000 students in eighteen school boards. The program is based on modes of writing suggested by James Britton and James Moffett, and criteria for evaluation have been compiled in a "handbook", copies of which are

obtainable from the investigator.

Investigators: Gilles Gagné and M. Pagé
Institution: Université de Montréal, Montréal, Québec
Topic: Etude et analyse de facteurs psycholinguistiques qui conditionnent l'enseignement et l'apprentissage du français, langue maternelle, au pré-scolaire, à l'élémentaire et au secondaire.

Investigators: G.M. Huntley, et al.
Institution: Department of Education, Concordia University, Montreal, Quebec
Topic: L'identification et l'essai des séquences optimum d'enseignement, particulièrement en ce qui a trait aux compétences linguistiques fondamentales.

Investigator: Hayden L. Leaman
Institution: Department of English Education, University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, New Brunswick
Topic: "English Writing Assessment Programme." This assessment of the writing of thousands of students in grades 5, 8 and 11 was commissioned by the New Brunswick Department of Education. The purposes of the study are "to assess whether, in the Province as a whole, existing programs are accomplishing the writing aims set forth in the various courses of study, and to make sufficient

information available to teachers so that they may assess for themselves the quality of their own students' writing as compared with that of a representative sample of students from across the Province as a whole." A Final Report was submitted to the Minister of Education in March 1978.

Investigator: Lloyd MacDonald

Institution: The Educational Research Institute of British Columbia, 1237 Burrard Street, Vancouver, B.C. V6Z 1Z6

Topic: The English Placement Test Project. The investigator notes that "E.R.I.B.C. is under contract with the Ministry of Education of British Columbia to design and administer a test that will assist post-secondary institutions in placing first-year students in appropriate English courses. The most important purpose of the Test is to identify students most in need of supplementary instruction in English usage and composition. The second purpose is to determine whether a single test can reliably predict success in regular first-year post-secondary English courses. The ability of the English Placement Test as a predictor will be compared with grade 12 teacher-assigned English

marks as predictors. The initial analysis will be undertaken in June 1978. The first sitting of the English Placement Test was on May 3 [1977] with over 17,000 persons writing at that time. The Test will be offered in August and again in November. This pattern will continue until at least May 1979."

Investigator: Iris F. McIntyre

Institution: Department of Secondary English, College of Education, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85281

or

Alpha Secondary School, 4600 Parker Street, Burnaby, B.C.

Topic: "A critical examination of the literature pertaining to the verbal portion of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SST-V), 1968-78." (This research is being done for a Ph.D. dissertation at Arizona State University.) The investigator has also written unpublished papers on methods of teaching expository writing and editing.

Investigator: Jean-Guy Milot

Institution: Commission des Ecoles Catholique de Montréal

Topic: A curriculum for primary and secondary schools.

Investigator: Martin Nystrand

Institution: c/o Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Topic: "Assessing Written Communicative Competence: A Textual Cognition Model."

Investigator: Michel Pagé

Institution: Department of Psychology, University of Montreal, Montreal, Quebec

Topic: A theoretical model for teaching composition in the mother tongue ¢French@. A related study will test this model at the primary level. Both reports are being written in connection with the development of a provincial curriculum for teaching the mother-tongue in Quebec elementary schools.

Investigator: Roland Pelchat

Institution: Université du Québec à Montréal, Montréal, Québec

Topic: Etude psycholinguistique de l'acte de lire et d'écrire: implications didactiques à l'université et à l'école.

Investigator: S.D. Robinson

Institution: Department of Curriculum Studies, College of

Education, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

Topic: A study of the effect of sentence-combining practice upon the writing of junior high school students. The investigator describes this research as "a replication of Frank O'Hare's study."

Investigators: Marlene Scardamalia and Carl Bereiter

Institution: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario

Topic: "The Development of Decentration in Writing." This study is "a developmental investigation of the ability of the writers to take their reader's point of view, both under conditions where sensitivity to the reader's informational needs must be spontaneously generated and under conditions where sensitivity to such needs is experimentally induced."

Investigator: Josée Valiquette

Institution: Développement Pédagogique, Ministère de l'Education, 600 Fullum St., Montréal, Québec H2K 4L1

Topics: Functions of language in students from six to sixteen and suggestions for a related curriculum.

(The investigator notes that her analysis of functions is based on the work of James Britton.)

The development of syntactic maturity in students from six to twelve and suggestions for a related curriculum.

A report of on the findings of a group of Quebec researchers who visited France in 1975 to observe new practices in the teaching of grammar.

Investigators: N. Van Grunderbeeck, et al.
Institution: Université de Montréal, Montréal, Québec
Topic: Analyse des stratégies employées par les enfants dans le décodage et le codage d'un message écrit et proposition de stratégies nouvelles dans un but de rééducation.

Investigators: Kathleen B. Whale and S.D. Robinson
Institution: College of Education, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
Topic: An study of students' writing in selected schools in Saskatchewan. The investigators state that this research is "an extension of James Britton's study of the development of writing abilities." (A report of this study was completed in November, (1977).

(iii) DENMARK

Investigator: Mogens Jansen

Institution: The Royal Danish Institute of Education, Hermodsgade 28 2200, Copenhagen N., Denmark

Topic: A systematic analysis and register of instructional techniques in all textbooks available for use in teaching the Danish language from grades one to seven (ages 7 to 13). The analytical categories in this register are consistent with the curriculum recommended for Danish schools. Instructional techniques are defined as specific, practicable classroom activities or procedures. Thi register was compiled with the assistance of experienced teachers.

(iv) UNITED KINGDOM

Investigator: John Dixon

Institution: Bretton Hall College of Education, West Bretton, Wakefield, Yorkshire WF4 4LG

Topic: "English 16-19 (EN 16 01)." The Schools Council Project Information Centre (160 Great Portland Street, London W1N 6LL) describes this project as follows:

AREA OF INQUIRY

In the spring of 1973, the Council's English Committee arranged eleven regional conferences for those concerned with the teaching of English in the sixth form and in further education, and these were followed by a national conference at York in 1974. Delegates questioned the suitability of traditional approaches to sixth form English for many of those staying on at school beyond 16, and asked the Schools Council for assistance in the redefinition and clarification of English studies in the 16-19 age range, and in experiments with patterns of organizing and methods of teaching English with this age group.

This project was therefore established:

1 to document a range of interesting studies in schools and colleges of further education, and on this basis to prepare discussion papers for local or regional study groups

2 to prepare a theoretical analysis of English 16-19, relating this where possible to language functions in associated subjects

3 to co-ordinate regionally and locally organized study groups aiming to develop and test pilot programmes and approaches in English 16-19, adapted to their particular circumstances

4 for selected schools and colleges to co-ordinate trials of experimental programmes of work, some of them organized in the form of a common core plus electives.

PROCEDURE

The first phase of the project's work will be to stimulate the setting up of local or regional study groups; to inform and support their work by a range of discussion materials; to work with local teachers, advisers and inspectors in regional workshops; and to encourage the production of detailed reports on experimental work in progress. Some groups are likely to concentrate on specific areas of English such as imaginative writing, film, oral work, language and communication, and others may focus on the whole range of English studies.

During the second phase the project team hope to help participating teachers develop a fuller theoretical understanding of English 16-19 by an analysis of language functions; to examine work already undertaken in the light

of this analysis; and to focus on links between English and other subjects.

The third phase will be document the experimental programmes, and undertake a joint evaluation with the teachers in a series of study conferences. During the fourth year one team member will prepare reports and other documents for publication, and organize group meetings and conferences.

Investigator: B. Newsome

Institution: Goldsmiths' College, University of London, New Cross, Lewisham Way, London SE 14 6NW

Topic: "English in the Middle Years of Schooling." The Schools Council Project Information Centre (160 Great Portland Street, London W1N 6LL) describes the scope of this project as follows:

AREA OF INQUIRY

This project was set up to consider the place of English in the curriculum between the years 8-13, based on a study of promising practice in schools. This has involved investigation of the language opportunities offered to children across the age range, including different reading, writing, dramatic and spoken activities, with some attention to the ways in which opportunities vary with environment, intake and school organization.

PROCEDURE

During the course of the project the team made intensive studies in a range of primary, middle and secondary schools, from rural and urban areas, working and middle class districts and with differing types of curriculum. Data collected included observation of lesson procedures, examples of written work, tape recordings of oral and dramatic work, and statements by pupils about their curricula.

FINAL REPORT

A report, intended for teachers, administrators, curriculum planners and research workers, will be published in 1977, in the Working Paper series. It begins with an anthology of children's work across the age range in different learning contexts. This work is the heart of the study and informs the analysis throughout. The inquiry is placed in a theoretical framework, drawing on the work of Vygotsky

and Britton, but the discussion anchored firmly in the classroom.

In chapter 2 the authors try to comment helpfully on the difficulty pupils so often find when facing information and ideas far removed from commonsense, everyday knowledge.

The potential of talk for learning in different situations, some structured, some more informal, is examined in chapter 3. In the second part of the chapter there is an assessment of the special contribution of improvised speech in making accessible ideas which might otherwise remain remote and inaccessible.

The fourth chapter views writing not only or even chiefly as a means of communication, but as a way of making sense of what confronts the reader. It includes a study of the poems and stories in which pupils find satisfaction, and also considers writing across the curriculum. The authors raise the question of the place of skills and how teachers can best help pupils to master these, and finally, in asking what is development and progress in writing, look at what pupils can achieve in writing at extreme ends of the age range studied.

The report closes with a consideration of the implications for practice which seem to have emerged from the inquiry, and an assessment of the implications for language and learning of different ways of organizing the curriculum.

(v) UNITED STATES

Investigators: Charles Cooper, et al.

Institution: Department of Instruction, Faculty of Educational Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo, Amherst, N.Y. 14260

Topic: "A Cross-Sectional Study of the Development of Writing." (Professor Odell reports that this project involves some 500 students at ages 8, 13, 17 and 20-21. At least four samples of each student's writing in each of three discourse

types - expression, explanation, and persuasion - are being analyzed with "primary trait" procedures. These samples will also be analyzed with respect to "diction, syntax, cognitive processes and organization."

Investigator: Diane Foley

Institution: The State Superintendent's Composition Task Force, Department of Public Instruction, State of Indiana, Room 229, State House, Indianapolis, Ind., 46204

Topic: The purpose of this "Composition Task Force" is "to explore program possibilities for students and for teacher training."

Investigator: Donald Graves

Institution: Department of English, Faculty of Education, University of New Hamshire, Durham, N.H. 03824

Topic: i) A bibliography of research on the teaching of composition. Professor Graves notes that this bibliography now consists of about 600 items written after 1920. Abstracts have been prepared for all articles and an analytical subject index devised. At least 35% of the items listed are not to be found in ERIC. The bibliography is being designed for use by both researchers and

practising teachers, and it will eventually be placed on computer.

ii) Balance the Basics: Let Them Write, a survey of the status of writing and the teaching of composition in American schools. This monograph was published by the Ford Foundation in February 1978. Copies are obtainable from the Publication Office of the Ford Foundation, 320 E. 43rd Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

iii) "Language Arts Textbooks: A Writing Process Evaluation" Language Arts, Volume 54 (October, 1977), pp. 817-23.

Investigator: James Gray

Institution: U.C. Berkeley/Bay Area Writing Project, School of Education, Tolman Hall, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 94709

Topic: Members of the U.C. Berkeley/Bay Area Writing Project have compiled a brief annotated bibliography entitled "A Selected Bibliography of OLD Studies on the Teaching of Grammar and Composition." (See also Part II below: The California Writing Project.)

Investigator: Andrew Kerek, et al.

Institution: Sentence Combining Project, c/o Department of English, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 45056

Topic: "Experimental Study in Transformational Sentence Combining as a Means to Increase Syntactic Maturity, Writing Effectiveness and Reading Comprehension among Students in Introductory College Composition Courses." The aim of this study is to prove the value and usefulness of transformational sentence-combining as a means of teaching college-level freshmen to write and read more effectively. The study indicates that "introductory college composition classes which focused on sentence-combining were able to produce statistically significant increases in (a) syntactic maturity and (b) writing effectiveness over the control classes taught by the traditional essay-analysis approach." This research appears may have implications for teaching composition at the secondary school level. An unpublished report of the experiment it has been prepared for the Exxon Education Foundation, which has supported this project. A briefer account may be found in Donald A. Daiker et al, "Sentence-Combining and Syntactic Maturity in Freshman English," College Composition and Communication (February, 1978), 36-41. Two additional articles on the project will be published within the next year in Language and Style and Research in the Teaching of English.

Investigator: Thomas MacLennan

Institution: Department of Instruction, Faculty of Educational Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo, Amherst, N.Y. 14260

Topic: "An analysis of the process by which sixteen-year-olds come to use a heuristic procedure in preparing to write a draft." (This is the subject of a doctoral dissertation supervised by Professor Lee Odell.)

Investigator: Anne Matsuhashi

Institution: Department of Instruction, Faculty of Educational Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo, Amherst, N.Y. 14260

Topic: "Timed Video-Tapes of Bright Seventeen-Year-Olds Actually Engaged in the Process of Writing." The purpose of this study is to discover the significance of pauses in the act of drafting. (The topic is the subject of a doctoral dissertation supervised by Professor Lee Odell.)

Investigatory: Willis L. Pitkin, Jr.

Institution: Department of English, College of Humanities, Arts & Social Sciences, Utah State University, Logan, Utah 84322

Topic: "A Teachable Model of Discourse Operation." This model is based on the theory that "all

language is hierarchally organized, not only in the construction of the sentence but also in the construction of connected discourse." The basic units of discourse in this model are, however, neither the sentence nor the paragraph but "discourse blocs" in a hierarchical system of binary relations. The investigator reports that the model has been used successfully in the teaching of freshman composition at Utah State University and suggests that it could also be used to teach expository writing at the high-school level.

The investigator has written several papers describing this method of teaching composition: "A Pedagogical Model of Discourse Structure," an unpublished doctoral dissertation (University of Southern California, 1973); "Discourse Blocs," College Composition and Communication (May 1969); "Sentence Combining and Discourse Hierarchy," Utah English Journal (1974-75); "Hierarchies and the Discourse Hierarchy" and "X/Y: Some Basic Strategies of Discourse," College English (March 1977); "Hierarchical Base-Combining," an unpublished paper; "X/Y: Writing Two Steps at a Time," a preliminary draft for a textbook to be published by Winthrop Publishers in 1979.

Investigator: Nancyanne Rabiansky

Institution: Department of Instruction, Faculty of Educational Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo, Amherst, N.Y. 14260

Topic: "An analysis of the relation between students' conceptual levels and their ability to use two different types of heuristic procedure." (This topic is the subject of a doctoral dissertation supervised by Professor Lee Odell.)

Investigator: Gary Martin Salvner

Institution: University of Michigan

Topic: "Using Collaboration to Teach English Composition: Theory, Model and Research" (Ph.D. thesis, 1977). An abstract of this thesis may be found in University Microfilms International, Dissertation Abstracts International, February 1978, Vol. 38, No. 8, p. 4634-A.

B. SOME CANADIAN COURSES ON THE TEACHING OF COMPOSITION

(i) CANADA

Instructor: Peter Hunt

Institution: Faculty of Education, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, N.S.

Course Title: "Education 440: Curriculum and Instruction in English Teaching."

The instructor makes the following comments about the teaching of composition in the context of this course:

> First of all, I am chary of considering the teaching of composition on its own. Specifically my experience is that, while a good teacher will certainly give lessons (and demonstrations) on such topics as planning an essay (a matter which, in a rich context, can be very fruitful) and will correct in detail a good deal of work by students, reading is the fundamental source of good writing. The real problem is in reading. The best source of good writing is the reading of excellent books. Thus, in my B.Ed. classes I concentrate on getting students to see this truth and to improve their own silent and oral reading. Most graduates today are very ill-read. A high school teacher should be well-read. Most have little acquaintance, for example, with the nineteenth-century novel or the great body of nineteenth-century poetry. Their B.A. tends to be a fragmented and skimpy affair and so one has to try to cultivate their awareness of the need for much more reading. Ill-read teachers can do little to improve their students in the high-schools. And reading aloud is very important in effective teaching of English, especially in today's conditions. I try to get them to improve in this art. Over many years, I have kept my eye on the close correlation between reading background and composition "skills." Our first duty is to develop good reading habits.
>
> Secondly, composition can be closely related to reading (and not merely develop naturally through reading generally and much writing contemporaneous with it) through the following means: (i) Much comprehension work requiring written answers ranging from one sentence to perhaps a half-page or more; (ii) Essays (and other short exercises) on literature studied in the classroom..., (iii) Language work involving a dynamic approach to words and their origins, their nuances

of meaning and their use in living contexts..., (iv) Exercises in style, that is, practice in using kinds of phrasing, imitating models of good prose (without any suggestion of slavishness), study of rhetoric and its various methods; (v) Work in syntax, e.g. sentence and paragraph work. An example of this would be sentence-building from shorter sentences, exercises in variety (different ways of expressing an idea etc.), correction of incorrect passages, re-writing of passages to make them more concise or clearer. All of this (of which I have much material) is blended in with other work, reading being always the central component and the life-blood throughout. Recent research in Research in the Teaching of English (e.g. 9, I, Spring, 1975) has confirmed what experience has shown seasoned teachers, that sentence-combining exercises are rewarding. But, again, I stress concurrent reading.

Thirdly, teachers must demonstrate what they teach. They should take students through the whole experience and process (a poor word) of writing by explaining the ways in which essays grow, in showing from the very beginning how a good essay can be planned ... and written. This necessitates their actually writing compositions themselves, using blackboard, paper, student suggestions and so on. Another method used in conjunction with this is the use of students' own compositions, either from previous classes or from a class or school magazine. This, in turn, can be related to newspaper articles (there are still a few good ones) and anthologies of essays studied in class. In these ways, students have both the work of professional (or even classic) authors and the best of their fellow-students' work as example and stimulus. Films and other media can be woven into such a spectrum. Similar (though also different) methods may be used with imaginative, say, short-story writing. A good, creative teacher will find many ways of kindling their imaginations, e.g. through music, pictures, suggested openings (which they may discard but find helpful) oral story-telling, and so on. And teachers must provide detailed and helpful comment on all written work.

Edith Smoak's research article ["The Composition Topic: Trends, Fashions, Attitudes, 1900-1972," Alberta English Spring, 1972,

12:5-23.] is useful in showing how effective teachers have always stressed "exciting the minds of the students, making them feel they have something to say." I would add that mere excitement is not nearly enough and that enriching their minds is a primary duty. However, allowing for exceptional schools, no school can be a substitute for the home where good conversation is common, good books are read and available.

Instructor: Glenn Martin

Institution: Department of Secondary Education, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Course Title: "Education Curriculum Instruction 453." This is a senior undergraduate course on teaching composition and language.

Instructor: Unidentified

Institution: Department of Curriculum Studies, College of Education, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

Course Title: "EDCUR 371 - Advanced Composition."

Instructor: Unidentified

Institution: Faculty of Education, Brandon University, Brandon, Manitoba

Course Title: "Education 24.322." This course is designed to teach the significance and function of oral and written communication and its relationship

to the secondary school program. Instructional approaches and materials are emphasized, and the prospective teacher is provided with opportunities to practise various forms of oral and written communication.

Instructor: Unidentified

Institution: Department of Curriculum, Humanities and Social Sciences, Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2N2

Course Title: "The Teacher and the Writing Process." This course provides "(a) practical experiences in preparing, transcribing and editing written materials and (b) opportunities to examine a variety of techniques for teaching written communication."

C. SOME NORTH-AMERICAN IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR PRACTISING TEACHERS OF COMPOSITION

(i) CANADA

Co-ordinator: Yvan Pelchat

Institution: Service générale de la formation du personnel de l'enseignement, Ministère de l'Education, 1035 rue de la Chevrotière, Québec G1R 5A5

Program: The "Programme de perfectionnement des maîtres de français" has been developed by the Quebec Ministry of Education to provide in-service training for teachers throughout the Province. It is administered through the Province's faculties of education in collaboration with Ministry consultants and consists primarily of off-campus courses on the theory and techniques of teaching the mother-tongue at different levels. Each faculty has also been asked to carry out applied research on techniques of instruction.

(ii) United States

Co-ordinator: Joanne Baker

Institution: English and Reading Education, Division of Instruction, 64 North Main Street, Concord, N.H. 03301

Program A series of four workshops in the teaching of writing. When these workshops were held in the spring of 1977, 20 selected classroom teachers spent a total of 20 hours with University of New Hampshire faculty members exploring methods of improving student writing. Participants were asked to apply what they had learned in their classrooms and were then given an opportunity to discuss the results with workshop leaders. The

topics covered by the workshop included the following: "Teaching the Organization of Ideas and Giving Effective Assignments" (Professor Thomas Carnicelli); "Techniques for Evaluating Student Papers and Conducting Effect Conferences" (Professor Lester Fisher and "Creating a Climate for Classroom Writing" (Professors Murray, Carnicelli and Fisher).

Co-ordinator: Edward L. Dambruch

Institution: State of Rhode Island, Department of Education, Hayes Street, Providence, R.I. 02908

Program The Rhode Island Teacher Center Project includes a training program for the teaching of "functional writing skills."

Co-ordinator: Charles R. Duke

Institution: Department of English, Plymouth State College, Plymouth, N.H.

Program: "Project Write: A series of workshops for English teachers in New Hamshire." This series of five workshops in the writing process is offered twice a year in New Hamshire at different locations. Participation is sought from as many schools as possible, although enrolment is limited to one teacher from each school and total

enrolment in the series is limited to 25. A participant must agree to attend all five workshops in the series. The registration fee covers the cost of a basic reference library on the teaching of writing. This is used by the participant during the workshops and later deposited in the departmental library of the participant's school. "Project Write" is made possible by a grant from a private donor.

Co-ordinator: Max Morenberg

Institution: Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 45056

Program: A conference on sentence-combining and the teaching of writing to be held on October 27-28, 1978 at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. This conference will explore recent developments in sentence-combining research with an emphasis on their application to the teaching of writing and related language skills. Teachers of composition, researchers and directors of writing programs at all levels are invited to attend.

PART II

THE CALIFORNIA WRITING PROJECT

Two documents about the California Writing Project, which was established in 1976, are presented below. The first is a brief history of the Project, written in 1977 by George F. Nemetz, a consultant in the State of California's Department of Education. The second, a paper written in 1973 on "the state of knowledge about written composition," describes a program of teaching and research originally planned for the Project by collaborators at the University of California. Further information about this work in California, which is similar in certain respects to Quebec's Programme de perfectionnement des maîtres de francais (described in Part 1.C. above), may be obtained from Professor James Gray, U.C. Berkley/Bay Area Writing Project, School of Education, Tolman Hall, University of California, Berkley, California 94709.

A. "A Brief History of the California Writing Project" by George F. Nemetz

In November, 1975 representatives of the University of California Faculty Senate and administration met State Department of Education administrators to discuss the evident decline among entering university students in competencies in written expression and basic mathematics. It was agreed that the University and the Department needed to work together to remedy this situation. Since that time, the University committee has continued to meet periodically with Dr. William E. Webster,

Deputy Superintendent for Programs in this agency and has arrived at a set of recommendations which will be submitted to the U.C. Faculty Senate and the University Board of Regents in the near future. Many of these recommendations center on the need to improve student competencies with the composing process and are very much in support of the Bay Area Writing Project and the California Writing Project.

In early February, 1976 the Department sponsored a two-day meeting for an invited group of 35 participants including public school teachers, administrators, high school students, and university faculty members and sought advice as to how the Department could help solve the problem of evidently declining student competencies in writing. Perhaps the most significant outgrowth of this meeting and the aforementioned meetings with the U.C. committee has been a growing commitment to address the problem from a cooperative stance. Working relationships have been established between universities, colleges, community colleges, contry schools offices, and school districts in efforts to cope with the problem.

Several recommendations were made by the participants in the February, 1976 meeting, but the one receiving greatest emphasis dealt with the need for appropriate inservice education. Out of this grew the Department sponsored California Writing Project which is fostering the development of such inservice education in all regions of the State. The Project has centered on a model known as the University of California, Berkeley/Bay Area Writing Project. The Department has sponsored several workshops designed to:

1. Inform participants about the Bay Area Writing Project
2. Inform participants about proposal writing and funding possibilities
3. Motivate proposal writing and, ultimately, the formation of new additional writing centers throughout the State.

As a result of these efforts it is now projected that this State will have nine centers similar to the Bay Area Writing Project within the next six to eighteen months.

Central to the Bay Area Writing Project is the selection and training of cadres of teachers of writing who then serve as inservice education leaders and change agents in their own and other schools and colleges. Each summer 25 carefully selected teachers, from elementary through university, spend six weeks on campus during the summer as University of California Fellows. They receive an intensive program in how to effectively teach the

composing process to their students and also how to teach these skills to their peers. During the subsequent year they continue with their regular teaching but, through negotiation with their own institutions, they are occasionally released to conduct inservice education programs. The Center at the University serves as a clearinghouse to supply teams of these especially trained people to applicant districts and colleges which desire inservice education programs. Since the inception of the project in 1974, some 80 educators have received such training and they, in turn, have provided inservice education for hundreds of others whose new knowledge has touched the lives of legions of students. When the anticipated nine centers are operative in California, some 225 to 300 such teachers will be trained annually with attendant impact on thousands of their peers and, ultimately, most of the students in the State.

A typical outgrowth of the California Writing Project has been the formation and continued operation of the Los Angeles Basin Writing Council. Composed of representatives of districts, county schools offices, and higher education, the Council has continued to meet since its inception in May, 1976 and is aiding in the dissemination of information and the preparation of proposals regarding the establishment of writing centers in the greater Los Angeles area in the near future. Similar councils have been formed in other regions of the State.

An ancillary activity of the California Writing Project has been to bring to the State leading figures in the nation and, indeed, in the world with expertise in the teaching and learning of the composing process. In December, the Department brought to California Dr. A.D. Van Nostrand, Director of the Writing Research Center at Brown University, who conducted publicly announced seminars in both the northern and southern parts of the State. In March, 1977 the Department will co-sponsor with U.C. Berkeley and U.C. Riverside a similar visit by Dr. James Britton, a leading British authority on the subject ... . It is anticipated that other authorities will be brought to California in the months ahead to further enlighten leading California educators about the very latest findings and the most promising practices in this area.

B. "The State of Knowledge About Written Composition," a paper written in 1973 by Dr. James Gray of the University of California, Berkeley/Bay Area Writing Project.

The State of Knowledge About Written Composition

i. From Professional Research

Research in written composition has been constant but slow - slow in answering the questions that still go begging about how we learn to write, and, as a result, slow in catching the interest of the profession at large. Since the 1963 publication of Research in Written Composition, however, interest in scientific research into the writing process has increased markedly. New studies of research have been published, notably Four Problems in Teaching English: A Critique of Research, 1969. The National Council of Teachers of English has issued a new quarterly publication, "Research in the Teaching of English," and now grants an annual award for outstanding research in the field of English. Significantly, we no longer seem to have as we once did, many skeptics or foes of research into teaching practice. Nevertheless, what we know at this time seems scant indeed; our knowledge gained from research into classroom practice is still in its embryonic stage. However, from those studies that withstand scrutiny we do know the following:

- that the teaching of formal grammar (if divorced from writing, if taught as a substitute for writing) has a negligible or, because it usually displaces some instruction and practice in actual composition, even a harmful effect on the improvement of writing.

- that mere writing does not teach writing; that is, the act of writing alone, the simple increasing of the number of writing opportunities, does not result in significant improvement in writing skill.

- that less writing in conjunction with better teaching of writing will obtain measurably superior results.

- that different intensities of grading do not significantly affect the quality of student writing.

- that reading and the study of written prose has a positive effect on the quality of student writing.

- that sentence combining exercises, as an approach to composition, can increase sentence maturity.

There are other hints and glimmers from research that are not listed, either because the results are too tentative, the sampling much too narrow, or, as is true in most cases, the studies marred in one way or another through faulty research design. In fact, one of the great revelations from the recent critiques of research into written composition is how inadequate most of it is. The authors of Research in Written Composition, for example, examined over 1,000 pieces of research during a two-and-a-half year period and found only five studies that merited extensive reporting.

Not only is most research to date of little value but those studies which do have merit represent only a small area of that territory which needs to be explored. Most questions basic to the teaching or learning of writing are as yet untouched by careful research. As of this moment we do not have answers, based on solid research, to any of the following questions: Of what does skill in writing really consist? How does a writer generate sentences? What is involved in the act of writing? What forms of discourse, if any, have the greatest effect on other types of writing? How is writing affected by extensive study and imitation of models? At what point in a writer's development can particular aspects of writing most effectively be learned? What kinds of situations and assignments at various levels of schooling stimulate a desire to write well or result in the most effective writing? What do different kinds of students prefer to write about? What procedures of teaching and learning composition are most effective for pupils of low socio-economic patterns? What relationships exist between the oral and the written language?

Implications: Such awareness of current research will effect the directions of the Writing Project in two fundamental ways:

1 a. In our various contacts with teachers we will encourage all teachers, no matter what their leanings, into some conscious act of the teaching of composition, whether it be through the examination of models, through revision, through the examination of syntax, through the exploration of different modes of discourse, through the experimentation of point of view and audience situations, through student reading-response groups, or whatever, and we will discourage those teachers who are satisfied that composition is being taught when their students make regular journal entries or write for ten minutes each class hour and nothing more is done.

b. We will encourage direct teaching of composition and discourage those who still, initially, prepare their students for writing by building a foundation of grammatical knowledge.

c. We will try to convince those conscientious teachers who put hour upon hour into correcting papers that their time with composition might be better spent in planning for teaching.

2. We will initiate extensive field evaluation in the Target Area schools throughout the nine-county area of those key questions that demand thorough examination (stated above and in the Evaluation section). We will replicate past studies that need additional classroom testing. We

will encourage field evaluation of ideas, methods, and approaches as a component part not only of the teaching act but of the writing process as well. We will report the results of this intensive field activity in the uniform reports of the University of California BERKELEY/Bay Area Writing Project.

ii. From Academic Research

In recent years, scholars working in a variety of related fields - rhetoric, logic, literary criticism, stylistics, linguistics - have gained insights that can, with knowledgeable understanding and translation, directly influence the classroom teaching of writing. Rather than merely cite the mass of such scholarship, we will examine a sampling of such studies that illustrate how scholarship can have, through the efforts of the UCB/BAWP, a profound impact upon the teaching of writing in the schools.

(1) Francis Christensen, Notes Toward a New Rhetoric, Harper & Row, 1968

In 1963 Professor Francis Christensen of the University of Southern California delivered a paper, "The Generative Rhetoric of the Sentence," at the Asilomar Language Arts Conference. In this paper Christensen illustrated the syntactic properties of modern prose style. (In similar research, with an added historical dimension, Professor Josephine Miles of this university affirmed Christensen's contentions by describing the three basic 'styles' of English prose - the verbal, the balanced, and the additive - and indicated that throughout the history of English prose one of these three styles has predominated during any given age. Her term for the present dominant style is additive; Professor Christensen's is cumulative - both terms describing the same characteristics.)

Christensen came to his major work almost by accident. He had been asked to 'do' a college rhetoric by one of the publishers. He started in on this task by examining the texts already in print, examining, as it were, his competition. This seemed a natural thing to do, but it proved to be far more important than he realized, for he discovered that all of the texts about writing ... [said the same things] (that sentences are simple, compound, or complex, or, from another point of view, loose, balanced, or periodic - that paragraphs have topic sentences that can appear either at the beginning, the middle or at the end, that they can be 'developed' in any number of ways, through comparison and contrast, through illustration and example, through definition, etc. - that certain possible construc-

tions such as the Absolute are to be shunned, etc.). He also discovered in examining older and earlier texts that these books had always said the same things, no matter when they had been written. In itself this disturbed him, but particularly because what these texts said about writing did not describe the writing he read every day in the articles in magazines, or in the novels or stories or works of non-fiction that he happened to be reading at the time. He noticed then - and this was a profound discovery because it had not been noticed before - that the 'writers' wrote one way while the textbooks taught another. So he stopped looking at past texts and began looking at writing instead. He looked for ten or more years. In that time he isolated out the characteristics of modern syntax that he discovered in his extensive examination of major American and British authors, and what he discovered he began publishing, in the 60's, in a series of journal articles. He discovered that sentences were, for the most part, loose, relying heavily upon the use of free sentences modifiers (verb, noun, adjective clusters, prepositional phrases, absolutes) and that these sentence modifiers were added or attached to the basic sentence clause, <u>not a part of it</u>. The presence of these additions, then, focused his attention upon the overpowering importance of the modifiers in determining sentence sense, as, for example, in this short exerpt from Hemingway's "The Undefeated": (The base clauses are underlined; all else is modification.)

> <u>He came straight</u>, his eyes on the man. <u>Fuentes stood still</u>, leaning back, the banderillos pointing forward. As the bull lowered his head to hook, <u>Fuentes leaned backward</u>, his arms came together and rose, his two hands touching, the banderillos two descending red lines, <u>and leaning forward drove the points into the bull's shoulder</u>, leaning far in over the bull's horns and pivoting on the two upright sticks, his legs tight together, his body curving to one side to let the bull pass.

He discovered more, about both sentences and paragraphs: that sentence variety, in the sense described in the texts, just doesn't exist, that most sentences - well over 80% - begin with the subject; that there is a basic and common subordinate/coordinate structure to both sentences and paragraphs; that texture is what writers vary - not syntax; that paragraphs are developed sentence by sentence and thus a variety of 'methods' can be employed within the same paragraph sequence, and on and on.

<u>Implications</u>: These discoveries of Christensen are obviously of interest and significance for the teacher of writing. During the

past few years UCB/BAWP has developed a successful way of presenting this material to students and classroom teachers:

a. isolating characteristics of modern prose style and presenting them to students as models in extensive sentence examples taken from actual professional writing,
b. asking students to model in sentences of their own the various characteristics of modern prose style, apply what has been learned through sentence modeling in longer sequences and longer structures, examine prose style in longer passages and longer structures and model these longer sequences as they once did with sentence models, and apply what they have learned in extended sequences.

This approach to student writing, whether applied at junior high, senior high, college, or graduate levels, has consistently resulted in student writing that is both mature and professional. And the methodology developed is both simple and transportable. In extensive UCB/BAWP-sponsored workshops over the past two years teachers throughout northern California have been introduced to this approach and have, in turn, introduced it into their classrooms.

(2) Josephine Miles, "What We Compose," NCTE, 1963, "Essay in Reason," Educational Leader, 1958; Style and Proportion: The Language of Prose and Poetry, Little, Brown & Co., 1967.

Professor Miles' study of language has had two centers of focus: the history of style from the beginnings of modern English prose to the present and the uses of reason in the predication and development of ideas.

English Prose Style: At any given period in the history of English prose it is possible to identify three distinctive prose styles, each with its own characteristics: a) the verbal, with a high density of clausal structures; b) the additive, at the other extreme from the verbal, with a high density of phrasal modifiers; and c) the balanced, best explained as a middle ground between the other two. In the Renaissance, for example, we can see the verbal style in the work of Sir Thomas More, the additive in the work of Roger Ascham, and the balanced in the work of Sir Francis Bacon. Furthermore, Professor Miles points out that at any given period in our past and in the present, not only are all three styles a constant in their appearance in the works of various authors, but that each period in time has its dominant style. She points to the additive and phrasal as dominant in the 20th century, and the

> characteristics of the additive style are those that Francis Christensen labeled 'cumulative,' his term for the style he too saw as dominant. That both scholars pointed to the same qualities in modern prose style is significant, but Miles' work goes a step further. Christensen's characterizing of the dominent prose style of our day is a masterful piece of scholarship, but at times he has seemed blinded by what he saw. He seems to deny all writing that does not fall within his definition of 'cumulative.' It is for Josephine Miles to point out that the verbal and the balanced are still very much in evidence in the works of many modern writers. Hers is a broader view than Christensen's, and, ultimately, of more value to the teacher of writing.

Implications: There is a dominant prose style in 20th century writing, additive or cumulative, call it what you will. It has characteristics that can be seen, studied, modeled and experimented with by students of writing: a syntax characterized by a main clause plus additions, as in the sentence by Hemingway previously referred to. But the verbal and the balanced styles have identifiable characteristics too, and they too can be and should be studied. With this broader view every characteristic of modern syntax can be presented to student writers, and, as a result, it is possible for young writers to gain the maximum of syntactic fluency in their own developing styles. The UCB/BAWP will examine this particular approach to writing (successfully taught to date in several pilot programs) in several related evaluation studies. This approach has many interesting aspects: it weds the study of language with the study of composition, and this is an area of research that has been sorely neglected. It trains young writers to be consciously aware of the potential of the English sentence, of what they can do when they set pen to paper; it is, thereby, an approach that teaches students how to write; it does not take for granted that they already can do so.

In striking contrast to the myriad rules of textbooks and their proliferation of contradictory methods, the work both of Miles and Christensen is a radical departure; in fact, it constitutes a quiet revolution. Their work creates a design for teaching and learning significant dimensions of writing, a design that is marked by an elegant simplicity precisely because they have penetrated through many of the surface approaches and external devices typical of the whole scaffolding of textbook sources from the 18th century to our own time. The models of Christensen and Miles consistently call attention to the way the mind underpins the flow of discourse, how it generates, works with and controls the patterns of language.

Uses of Reason: Textbooks frequently have great lists of one thousand and one topics to write about tucked away somewhere in

the back pages: Birds of Prey, My Favorite Movie, The Great Outdoors, A Dangerous Moment, etc. Students are expected to be able to take these subjects and make something of them in a prose essay. Such an idea is nothing less than nonsense, but it is for Josephine Miles to tell us why. It is not subjects that students develop when they write an essay, it is rather what they say about a subject. The subject, standing by itself, is aimless; it lacks direction, it can go every which way. On the other hand, when we add a predicate to the subject, we have then given it the shape of an idea; we have brought it under control. Simply put, a subject plus a predicate equals an idea. And it is the idea that wants developing. The student who couldn't write about New York in one of Josephine Miles' classes because, she said, 'It's too big; I'll write about Berkeley instead" still has this lesson to learn. The predicate controls the subject: no subject is too small or too large to write about, for it is what you say about the subject that will be developed. Once determined, the idea can be developed in a series of related sentences and paragraphs. It is here that Josephine Miles reminds us, in several essays written over the past twenty-five years, that ideas relate, one to another, in a limited number of ways: The relationship can be conjunctive: and-and; then-then-then; also; moreover. It can be disjunctive, separating, insisting on mutually exclusive alternatives: either-or; on the one hand - on the other; not this - but that. It can be concessive, assuming yet denying: though-yet; nevertheless; however, and, finally, relationships of ideas can be organized conditionally: if-then; because-therefore.

(3) On the other hand, Walker Gibson in Tough, Sweet and Stuffy, Indiana University Press, 1966 and Persona, Random House, 1968, emphasizes the writer's voice and its relation to a wide range of audiences. This is not to imply that Gibson overlooks syntax and meaning; on the contrary, he gives great attention to choices in diction, phrases and sentence patterns as he reveals how these create connotations and tones that produce a particular voice for a reader. His approach can be characterized, if oversimplified, by this description: he took the notion of persona, or speaker, which was central to the 'new criticism' and its attendant teaching strategies for literature and turned it around to face the problems of teaching composition. Whereas the teacher's opening question about a poem (especially in the 1950's and 1960's) might be "Who is the speaker?" Gibson would have writers start with the question, "Who is it that I am or imagine I am in this situation?" Concentrating, then, on the voice of the writer and the self it conveys to an audience, Gibson considers choices in word, phrase, clause, and sentence because it is these structures that intend to reveal in a given writing situation. Gibson's work in the elusive tonal zones of voice complement Josephine Miles' stress on

predication and its logical imperatives: both rhetoricians move from the inward dimension of composing outward to its implications in the choice and development of language. There is a need to bring such studies into focus - for instance, a need for further experimentation concerning voice and logic, these different dimensions of a writer's stance and his total performance. Perhaps the work of the Writing Project can achieve a more precise understanding of the relations between voice and logic and gain a better perspective from which to help students improve their abilities to write.

(4) James Moffett, Teaching the Universe of Discourse, and A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum, K-13, Houghton-Mifflin, 1968.

Drawing upon his own experience as a teacher and writer and his studies of language research, language psychology, and British educational experiments, Moffett developed a naturalistic curriculum for English that is the most comprehensive and original synthesis available at this time. He gives oral language its proper place in its important relation to the activity of writing. He also throws light upon the difficulties many students face with certain assignments at particular points in their development as writers. His schema of the levels of difficulty in writing assignments, starting with assignments that direct the student to look 'inward' to those that have him writing objective 'outward' looking pieces, poses the point that the difficulty a young writer faces with any particular assignment is, possibly, more a matter of what has gone on before than with the assignment itself: e.g., a 'good' assignment might be 'bad' if offered too soon, or out of sequence, for the developing writer.

Implications: Moffett's approach would encourage teachers to set up situations where talk and discussion could generate ideas for writing. Furthermore, he would have students write across a broad range of modes, with assignments ranging from the most personal or inward-looking to assignments that are general and outward-looking. The UCB/BAWP has developed course guides whereby this sequence of assignments, from experience to idea, can take place quickly, within a single unit, or within a single course. This notion strikes at a major cause of the current 'writing problem.' No one would deny that more journals - more experimental pieces are being written today than essays. Students write so much better in these personal forms. The project materials point the way this 'good' writing can be translated into good, analytical prose. This particular UCB/BAWP approach will be thoroughly field tested in several evaluation studies. We have had excellent results to date from several

pilot programs....

C. From the Experience of Individual Teachers

(1) Ken Macrorie, Uptaught, Hayden Book Company, 1970, Writing to be Read and Telling Writing, Hayden Book Company, 1968.

After suffering over generations of sterile student prose, Macrorie discovered, late in his teaching career, that students have a surer sense of tone and voice and a fresher and more spontaneous flow to their writing when allowed to write freely in response to their own ideas and feelings and personal experiences. In his hands this approach is developed into a complete composition program.

Implications: Macrorie's method is a natural for beginning writers, for poor writers - at any level, for students who are frozen when faced by a blank sheet of paper, and for students who have been blocked by a too heavy-handed red pencil. His approach teaches students that writing is a process involving many drafts and revisions, that final copy always can be improved upon. This is the way he works: he might ask a class to write freely on any topic for a short period of time every day over the next week. After five or six pieces have been written, he asks that the students either pick one to revise or work up a composite version from the best moments out of the earlier writings. This piece is brought into class and read aloud to a large and constant group of students (students begin in this way to write for a known audience and not just for the instructor). After the paper has been read aloud, he asks the reader to comment first; this is a very obvious yet original idea! The student is asked to comment on how he thinks the paper succeeded, and, even more importantly, he is asked to point out any sections or parts that he would now want to revise. As students read aloud they almost constantly come across phrases, particular words, whole sentences that strike them as "not right;" in fact, frequently teachers hear them correcting as they read aloud. The paper is then revised once more and handed in. By this time, the students will have written six, seven, even eight drafts before the instructor sees what they have done. When Macrorie does get the papers, he reads them at the typewriter and types sections he likes onto a ditto. In class he discusses at some length what it was he liked about each item on the ditto.

This is a strongly encouraging approach to student writing; it serves its purpose for particular students or for whole groups of students with particular problems. But it raises a serious question seldom voiced in the profession. When do you stop encouraging and when do you begin holding students responsible for what they have written? Certainly today there is a good bit of encouraging going on in English classrooms, but, from the

vantage point of the university, there does not seem to be much holding students responsible. Thus, students come to the university today who seemingly have never been challenged by a critical reader at any time in school. In the early weeks of the Subject-A program, their papers are still filled with gross errors that have never been challenged. The UCB/BAWP will approach this issue head on, and what we say should have national impact. And it will be quite simple. Students are somewhere on a continuum as they are learning how to write; with some, fourth grade is not too early to begin expecting a high standard of written prose; with others - even as late as junior college - a gentle, encouraging approach might still be necessary.

SUMMARY

The problem is not that there is nothing known about how students can be taught to write; the problem, simply, is that teachers do now know what already is known. Through the campus-based programs and the school-based programs that the UCB/BAWP has sponsored and will continue to sponsor teachers' awareness of what they can do in the classroom is stretched. A basic objective of the Writing Project is to enlarge the perspective of teachers, to give them a working knowledge of the various approaches that can be applied toward the improvement of written expression. Within the lifetime of the UCB/BAWP a wide community of teachers at all levels of instruction will have gained new knowledge, new insights into the writing process, and a surer sense of confidence over their own teaching and over what they can begin to expect from their student writers.

PART III

NEW ZEALAND AND SCOTLAND

INTRODUCTION

The same questionnaires that were distributed to Ontario Faculties of Education were sent also to appropriate authorities in New Zealand and Scotland. New Zealand's response consisted of returns from the Hamilton Teachers' College and from the Primary and Secondary Divisions of Christchurch Teachers' College, with the latter institution providing especially detailed information. Scotland's response included replies from the Centre for Information on the Teaching of English and from seven colleges of education: Aberdeen, Craigie, Dundee, Hamilton, Jordanhill, Notre Dame and Stirling. The information below is based on the returns from these institutions, whose practices appear to be not untypical of those in their respective countries.

(A) NEW ZEALAND

A general description of teacher training in New Zealand may be found in J.C. Dakin, Education in New Zealand (Newton Abbot, 1973), chapter 9. Teachers of English at the primary level in New Zealand are normally trained in a three-year college course; secondary school teachers ordinarily take a post-graduate course of one year's duration. (Colleges there also offer other courses of study leading to certification but these fall outside the scope of this survey.) Both the primary and secondary programs offer

methods for instructing pupils at the "intermediate" level, which in New Zealand comprises the eighth and ninth school years. The training of teachers at all levels is related in varying degrees to the Department of Education's prescribed syllabuses, which, at the senior secondary level, also define the subject matter on which students are externally examined.

Training in the Primary Division

All teachers-in-training in the Primary Division of Christchurch are required to take two courses which deal in part with methods of teaching expository writing: a forty-eight hour course entitled "Language Syllabus" and a seventy-two hour course designated "College English." Students intending to specialize in the teaching of English must also take a third course in English literature, in which the writing of expository essays is required. What follows below is a description of each of these three courses and an account of arrangements for practice-teaching at a sister institution, Hamilton Teachers' College.

1. "Language Syllabus." This course is taken by students in their first year. As its title suggests, it is designed to prepare them to teach the New Zealand Department of Education's syllabus: Language in the Primary School - English (1961). Two other documents published by the Department also serve as guidelines in this course: a Syllabus Revision

Report, which describes those skills which might reasonably be expected of average children at each grade level, and Suggestions for Teaching English in the Primary School, Parts I, II, III. The latter document is a book-length manual providing both a rationale for the school syllabus and descriptions of didactic techniques which experienced teachers have found effective in the classroom. These include several practical suggestions for teaching expository writing and for ensuring that appropriate levels of proficiency in writing are achieved in practice. The principal text read by students is Walter T. Petty, Dorothy C. Petty and Marjorie F. Becking, Experiences in Language: Tools and Techniques for Language Arts Methods (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1973 and 1976), a work that is also used in several Ontario faculties. Each chapter of this text suggests "activities for pre-service teachers", and students are obliged to carry out several of these.

Within the general framework of an "integrated" approach to language arts, about one-quarter of this course, or some twelve hours, is concerned with "written expression." In this part of the course students learn specific techniques for the teaching of handwriting, spelling, vocabulary, sentence-structure and usage. They are expected to become aware of both the developmental relationship between speech and writing and of the differences between these two modes of expression. A policy paper published by

the NCTE's Commission on Composition is given careful consideration and questions relating to grammar, "creativity" and "motivation" are also discussed. Through observational visits to a school, each student is required to analyze the speech and writing of at least one child and to suggest appropriate instructional techniques for overcoming observed deficiencies. A copy of the syllabus for this well-designed practical course is on file.

2. "College English." The general aims of this course are reported to be the following:

   a. To sharpen students' awareness of the standards they must reach in English and of the skills in language which as students and teachers, they must master.

   b. To develop in students a knowledge of, and feeling for language, its growth, its structure, and its function.

   c. To give continuing practice in language, in reading, writing, speaking, listening and thinking.

   d. To extend this knowledge of, and feeling for language through studies in literature. Such studies will also contribute to an understanding of the students themselves.

A correspondent at Christchurch notes that "experience with this course over a number of years has led all staff members to see the first, second and fourth aims as being more readily achievable through concentration on the third. Further development in the first aim has been [achieved through] the increasing emphasis on [students'] experiencing early the

language skills needed in the classroom." To indicate the context in which teaching of expository skills is attempted, our correspondent describes the general features of this course as follows:

Content and Method:

a. In the College English Compulsory Course it is often very difficult to separate content and method.

b. There are a few occasions when the subject matter is dealt with primarily for its own sake so that the word 'content' becomes appropriate: when this happens the content will tend to be 'language' and the bias is likely to be literary.

c. For most of the course and for much of what happens in each two hour period it is the language experience gained which is the most important part of the 'lesson.'

d. Subject matter, therefore, tends to be selected for its topicality and its relevance to students, and hence for its value in stimulating language development and for facilitating in some particular way the language experience.

e. Therefore, the College English lecturer will readily involve students in the selection of material for use in the language experiences and will just as readily use items drawn from the mass media or fields other than language or literature, such as sociology, psychology, or philosophy.

Some "College English" Activities:

a. Experience of different kinds of discussion groups including exercises involving conversation, small group discussion, meeting and debating procedure, the use of language laboratory, tape and video-tape recordings. The establishment of criteria for language skills involved in these oral exercises and the evaluation of the educational worth of discussion.

b. Experience of listening to speakers, readers' recordings, discussion and the identification of the skills involved in listening.

c. Experience of reading aloud adult or children's stories to small groups or to a whole group, and/or recording and dramatisation of stories, plays, poetry, etc. by the use of tape and audio-visual recorders.

d. Experience in the development of questioning and expository techniques using such aids as blackboards, static displays, models, overhead projectors and video tape-recorders.

e. The identification of reading habits and reading skills with the object of improving students' own comprehension and note-taking.

f. Experience of various kinds of writing: exposition, letters, reports, criticism, reviews, stories for children, dialogue, writing in response to particular experiences.

g. Experience of dramatic activities which have some relevance to the classroom: the use of scripted plays from various sources suitable for classroom activity.

h. Experience in the reading of a common text, for example novel, short story or poem and consequent sharing of a variety of responses including the critical and interpretative.

i. Extension into non-verbal forms of communication such as mime, movement, aspects of film and video production, and interpretation of the more purely visual aspects of the mass media.

About midpoint in this course, each student's oral and written expression is assessed by the instructor, and students whose performance is deemed deficient are required to do remedial work in a language-improvement program. Experience in these arrangements has led the College to conclude that the most fruitful way of trying to improve expository writing is through individual tutoring. As

students are normally involved in a regular program of expository essay writing, it is by working within this within this context ("realistic needs") that the College believes it can be most effective.

3. "Selected Studies." This course is designed to give students further training in the teaching of one selected subject. Students choosing English, for example, study English literature, including film and practical drama. No matter what subject is chosen, however, the writing of expository essays plays a significant part and teaching the "skills" and teaching the "subject" are seen as part of the same process. Our correspondent notes that general guidance is sometimes given by lecturers when setting written assignments but that in this advanced type of course students are more frequently given individual assistance in the development of expository skills.

Our correspondent remarks that formal composition skills are, in fact, well developed in a large proportion of students entering the program. A first impression of this competence is gained from a reading of an expository essay in which each entering student evaluates his or her own education to date. The College has experimented over the years with this assignment as an "in-class" or "out-of-class" exercise and currently favours the former as most useful. Instructors report that a second large group of

students could well improve their expository skills and they know their courses help in this regard. A minority of students, about ten percent, give them serious concern.

Practice Teaching:

Although no information about arrangements for practice teaching was received from Christchurch, the Hamilton Teachers' College, a sister institution with a similar curriculum, provided a description of the schedule there. At this institution, there are three terms in the academic year, and students are in the schools for varying periods during each of the nine terms of their program with the exception of the seventh. In fact, a total of twenty-nine weeks or about one-third of their training time is spent in schools. For the long, continuous practice periods, each student is allocated to a particular class, with an associate teacher to assist in supervision and evaluation. College staff visit the class once or twice during such periods to aid students and to evaluate their ability to teach in several curriculum areas, including language and mathematics. Each student must complete tasks set by the College staff, and our correspondent at Hamilton notes that, while the College would tend not to stipulate a task if thereby a conflict was caused with the associate teacher, "it would be rare for such a conflict to occur in a matter like teaching composition." The College's "Studies in Teaching Language" course, which is similar to Christchurch's "Language Syllabus" is, in fact, "school-based"

and involves a total of eighteen practice lessons in language by each student in the fourth and sixth terms and an evaluation of this teaching by College staff in the fifth. Students also have opportunities to practise the teaching of language during other practice periods, which are arranged according to the following schedule:

Term 1 - 1 week of observation

Term 2 - 1 1/2 days per week of observation and some practice

Term 3 - 4 weeks of continuous practice

Term 4 - 1 week of practice (distributed over the term) in the subject "Studies in Teaching Language"
1 week of practice in teaching swimming

Term 5 - 5 weeks of continuous practice

Term 6 - 4 weeks of continuous practice (including the teaching of several lessons in language)

Terms 8 and 9 - 9 weeks of practice, broken by spring vacation (3 weeks).

Secondary Division

The Secondary Division of Christchurch Teachers' College offers university graduates a one-year program. According to the Calendar, the English Department gives "First Major" and "Second Major" courses in both English and Drama for prospective teachers of these two subjects. The Department also offers an array of "Minor Courses" (Creative Writing, Drama, Speech, Effective

Speaking, Speed Reading and Remedial Reading), which are apparently designed to improve the personal skills of students specializing in disciplines other than English. Our correspondent in the Secondary Division remarks that students intending to qualify as English specialists are English graduates, "generally having very sophisticated writing skills." The College, therefore, offers no courses designed to develop the writing skills of the student-teachers themselves. He would recommend, however, "an increase in language studies" at the undergraduate level and an undergraduate course in linguistics as a prerequisite for those intending to train as English specialists.

Methods of teaching composition are an integral part of both the "First Major" and "Second Major" English courses. Although the two courses are similar in structure, the "Second Major" course is shorter, concerned more with content than with method, and limited normally in scope to methods appropriate for the junior years of secondary school. The instructor notes that "teaching composition in isolation is not part of ... ¢his@ syllabus" and that about sixty percent of these courses has to do with a wide range of secondary-school program material other than writing and language study. He estimates, nevertheless, that some twenty percent is concerned with the teaching of writing of various kinds. An outline of the course suggests more specifically that the following topics are discussed: ways of contriving that written work arises naturally from other English

activities; suggestions for relating written work to pupils' own experience, and to matters of direct concern to them; the wide variety of written 'exercises' other than the formal set-piece 'composition' or essay; problems of assessment; and the encouragement in a pupil of a critical, constructive attitude towards the pupil's own writing, the writing of other pupils and writing by professionals. A further twenty percent of these courses is concerned with approaches to the study of language and grammar. In the discussion of language study, the following seven topics are addressed: direct and indirect methods of extending vocabulary; dictionary use; the central position of metaphor in language-building and the role of metaphor as an element of style; figurative language in general; emotive and referential language; the language of argument and persuasion, including the English of advertising and the mass media; styles and registers in general. Traditional and more recent grammars are also considered, and there is discussion of the justification for methods of teaching grammar and the levels at which various tasks should be attempted.

Few composition textbooks are used in New Zealand's secondary schools and none is specifically recommended in this course. Nor does the instructor recommend what proportion of the study of English in schools be allocated to composition. In practice, about thirty percent is given to this aspect of the subject in the senior school in order to prepare pupils for external examinations.

Students in this program are required to spend thirteen weeks in practice-teaching during their training year, which in New Zealand ordinarily lasts about thirty-seven weeks exclusive of vacations and examination periods. The College can stipulate areas to be taught, and schools are generally cooperative in accommodating such requests.

(B) SCOTLAND

Scotland's Colleges of Education work within a national education system which facilitates cooperation between teachers at different levels and ensures coordination of their work. Within this general system, teachers of English and certain educational authorities have developed their own organizations to further the aims of their discipline. At the core of this subsystem is the Central Committee on English, an organization of subject specialists appointed by the Secretary of State and supported financially by the Department of Education. This Committee is "charged with the duty of promoting research and development in English teaching and the establishment of local organizations for development and experimentation in English." Its twelve members include several practising school teachers, a head-mistress, two College of Education instructors, two university teachers, two subject advisers (or consultants), a member of the Scottish Education Department (who serves as secretary) and an inspector (who acts as chairman). In

fulfilling its purpose, the Central Committee "issues from time to time various publications designed to assist teachers of English in all stages in the formidable task of developing the subject and its methods to meet the demands of new outlooks, techniques and conditions." Notable among these publications are the Committee's Bulletins, some five of which have been published to date, and its Working Papers, which "exemplify the approaches and techniques described in the Bulletins." (Both series are published by the Scottish Education Department and may be obtained from Her Majesty's Stationery Office, c/o Pendragon House, 2525 Dunwin Drive, Mississauga, Ontario.)

The Central Committee also carries out its work through its Centre for Information on the Teaching of English (CITE), which is situated in the Moray House College of Education (Holyroad, Edinburgh, EH8 8AQ). This unique institution was established in 1967 with the support of the Scottish Education Department and it acts as the executive arm of the Central Committee. It is the "focal point for curriculum development and support in English teaching in Scotland." Gathering information on the teaching of English as a mother tongue from many external sources, CITE is also in touch with local development groups throughout Scotland. It houses a large library on the teaching of English and maintains a postal lending service to teachers. One of the Centre's most important functions is publishing Teaching English: The Journal of English in Scotland. Edited by the Centre's Director, Mr. Sidney Smyth, this periodical carries articles on a

wide range of topics from diverse sectors of the profession. Questions of didactic theory and practice are considered within a Scottish context, and a thoughtful book review section keeps teachers informed about recent literature. The Autumn 1977 issue, for example, is concerned almost entirely with the teaching of composition and includes among its reviews a discussion of Jeannette T. Williams' Learning to Write or Writing to Learn? - an astute critique of the ideas of James Britton.

Teachers in training are invited to become thoroughly familiar with Teaching English as well as the various Bulletins and Working Papers of the Central Committee. Five of these documents are pertinent to the teaching of composition: English in the Secondary School - Earlier Stages (Bulletin No. 1); English in the Secondary School - Later Stages (Bulletin No. 4); Projects in Practice (Working Paper, 1970), The Teaching of English Language (Bulletin No. 5); English for Slower Learning Children in the Scottish Secondary School (The Report of a Sub-Committee, 1977); and English for the Young School Leaver (Bulletin No. 3).

The first of these pamphlets recommends an approach to the teaching of composition based on the following argument:

> That the communication skills are not single skills but rather sets of skills has long been known. But previous attempts to separate them into discrete processes for teaching purposes have proved unworkable. In their concentration upon writing, for example, past generations of English teachers have tried punctuation, spelling, word-building, sentence analysis, paragraph constructing and other procedures as separate activities in the belief that

> many separate lessons would all come together some day in the act of composition. Besides being an extremely uneconomic way of using very limited time, this kind of fragmentation has been discredited for sound pedagogic reasons. The modern teacher assumes that the skills which make up effective composition are much more numerous and more complex - so many and so difficult to identify that it is not useful to try to develop them singly. What makes pupil A better at composition than pupil B? - among other things, his more extensive vocabulary, his better command of the uncountable processes that generate sentences, his wider and deeper cultural heritage, his deeper interest, his greater concentration, his more creative intelligence. What will make pupil A better at English when he is sixteen than he is now at twelve? - among other things, his greater maturity, his added years of practice, his deeper sense of purpose. And each of these factors requires the qualification, "whatever that is." The fact is that we do not know. The skills we try to develop are aspects of human behaviour, and while we cannot yet analyse all the facets of linguistic behaviour we can at least recognise and cater for the fact that it is human: increasing efficiency in the skills of communication comes of extended experience, intensive and highly motivated practice, and training which is related to experience and motivation.

More specifically, the Committee distinguishes between two stages in the development of the writing abilities of secondary students. In the first stage, students can be most effectively stimulated to compose through role-writing in imagined situations that are as lifelike as possible. The recommended method for creating this imagined context is the "anthological project," referred to sometimes in the training colleges as "group work" because it is ordinarily undertaken by members of a whole class. It consists of a program of writing assignments carried out over many weeks and related sequentially to a situation or idea which has been conceived by the pupils themselves with the guidance of a teacher. Four or five imagined "actors" with specific writing

tasks to perform are usually an integral part of a project and their individual characteristics are likewise agreed upon by the class. The various writing tasks are then distributed among members of the class and the results constitute an "anthology." There are several types of such project, and all are reported to be successful in motivating students to write for different audiences in various registers, dialects, conventions, forms and genres. Teachers-in-training are given instruction in how to conduct anthological projects, and a Working Paper on the subject, Projects in Practice, provides helpful practical advice and a catalogue of project designs.

For students at the second and more mature stage of development, the Committee recommends a writing program based on the study of literary texts. The approach should at first be transdisciplinary and thematic and then, at the very senior level, text-centred and literary. English in the Secondary School - Later Stages defines the nature of such a program and reminds teachers that teaching a pupil how to compose is different from testing a final product. The importance of preparatory discussion, of providing for a variety of stimulating audiences and of frequent practice is stressed.

The utility of language study in the teaching of composition and relevant didactic techniques are discussed both in this Bulletin and in its sequel, The Teaching of English Language. The latter document notes that expository writing is an essential part of the senior-school curriculum:

> From Stage Two onwards pupils will more and more require to develop their ability to write good expository compositions, especially for subjects other than English. The kind of question recently introduced into the Higher Grade English examination tests some of the abilities required in such writing: selection of relevant information, arrangement in proper order, choice of appropriate tone and style. But other abilities are required, some of which ought to arise from the activities mentioned earlier: for instance, exactness of description. Some, however, will not, such as the ability to state cause and effect appropriately, or to qualify conclusions. These can only come from the exercise of thought on subjects on which the English teacher is not necessarily an authority. This will involve collaboration with other departments. If the History specialist complains about a pupil's poor English, this is surely the time for the English specialist to ask for a sample of the English complained of to compare it with the work the pupil has done in English and to take note of the real deficiencies in writing which exist. This will indicate the formal areas that need the English teacher's attention, and should lead him to encourage his colleague in the other subject to ensure that the pupils observe for him the conventions they would observe for the English teacher.

In English for Slower Learning Children in the Scottish Secondary School, the Committee offers practical advice for coping with a variety of problems requiring remedial attention.

Students preparing to be teachers of English in Scottish secondary schools are all university graduates with one of the following qualifications:

a) an Honours degree in English Literature and/or Language;

b) an Ordinary degree which contains at least two courses in English Language or Literature;

c) a Bachelor of Education degree which contains courses equivalent to the other specialist degrees.

In nearly all of the training institutions students spend approximately half their college time in teaching practice, but there is no specific requirement that any of the time should be devoted to the teaching of writing. The training program offered at a typical Scottish institution, the Hamilton College of Education, is described by a correspondent, Mr. William J. Jackson, as follows:

> It may be of interest to you if I were to outline the post-graduate one year course. This consists of thirty two teaching weeks and graduates are with the English Department for two three-hour sessions each week. There are three blocks of teaching practice in the course. At week 4 one week in school followed by two days per week in school for five weeks followed by two weeks in school. At week 18 four weeks in school and at week 28 four weeks in school.
>
> The first unit consists of eighteen hours. It is designed to equip students for their first teaching practice. Students consider critical areas in language acquisition; the language of the classroom; teacher-pupil interaction; basic lesson organisation in spoken language and in text-based lessons like poetry or prose passages. Students then go into schools for one week. They do not teach during that week. They will have a check-list of areas to observe and consider. School departments are asked to provide a time table that provides an over-view of the total English programme and which enables students to follow at least one class through a week's programme. We enjoy extremely good relations with local schools and they co-operate most willingly in the programme. Students are regarded as department members and have access to department resource material, planning sessions and assessment. Most schools have a promoted member of staff who acts as a student regent and most schools mount orientation programmes in which students may discuss general topics like discipline, organisation of comprehensive education, the guidance system, school/home relations, etc.
>
> Students then return to College for three days per week. They will have one session of three hours with the English Department. The emphasis is on spoken language moving into writing and on the discussion of points arising from the two days that students spend in school each week.

In schools students now begin to take classes, usually in the early stages. The emphasis is on spoken language situations, the development of writing skills and simple text-based situations. Students then do two weeks in school. During their time in school students will have various assignments to carry out - observation and the collection and analysis of material, e.g. children's writing or the analysis of text-books. Students will be seen by tutors at least three times during each teaching practice period. School departments are encouraged to observe students teaching and to allow students to observe experienced teachers at work. School reports on students tended to be somewhat bland but I can now rely on helpful and honest reports.

The second unit of eighteen hours consists of work in reading. It begins with the examination of higher order reading skills as exemplified in prose extracts and the short story.

I am not terribly happy about some of the extremely detailed lists of reading skills that tend to emanate from America. Teachers can't work with them in the classroom. I work with a limited list of skills which seem to me to be critical in developing adult reading skill and which relate to what is going on in talking and writing. Students then explore the use of unit studies of children's literature. They discuss the technique, examine exemplars and construct a unit study on a prescribed novel. We have a number of schools that work closely with the College in this and we usually call in experienced teachers to talk about their work. The next element in the reading unit is the teaching of literature with reference to poetry and the novel. The last element is drama as literature. A play is examined from two points of view - that of the drama expert and that of the literary expert.

Students then do four weeks in school. The emphasis is on reading and on working with older, academic classes. We hope to test literary skills in particular.

The third unit of eighteen hours deals with elements which I consider to be particularly difficult; work with mixed-ability classes in the comprehensive school, particularly individual or group methods; work with non-academic early leavers; the development of language skills, with special reference to the demands of national examinations. Again we can call in teachers with particular experience of such work, including remedial teachers, or members of the various examiners' panels.

Students then do four weeks in school. The emphasis is on mixed-ability work in the early stages and non-academic classes. Students are encouraged to try group and theme work. There are various assessment points in the course but there are no formal examinations. Students will be analysing material collected in schools or constructing lessons material -- first individual lessons, then short thematic programmes and programmes based on group work. Students will demonstrate their awareness of teaching objectives and their grasp of techniques in what they do in the classroom. There are few prescribed books - most of these are curriculum bulletins distributed by the Scottish Education Department or regional development groups or possible text-books. I do not wish to sound conceited but I don't really know of many good books on the teaching of English that are accessible to inexperienced students. Besides the course is so short that I like to keep in contact with 'real' material and situations the whole time and let principles emerge from these.

The only other department that reports on these students is Professional Studies (Education and Psychology). Essentially the decision as to whether or not these students are qualified as teachers lies with the English Department.

The course may seem desperately informal but with small groups we can get to know the students extremely well and there is plenty of time to talk through difficulties. Schools now have a fair idea of what we are after. I work closely with the local adviser in English; I am on the divisional English committee; we have various ad hoc committees composed of lecturers and teachers to oversee ongoing development work; the local authority and college co-operate in in-service work and it is expected that college lecturers will maintain a program of work in school.

I cannot help you very much with your investigation into expository writing as I don't teach it. The term 'expository writing' seems to me to derive essentially from the study of rhetoric and does not really relate to what children do in writing. It is an adult imposition and while I can recognise that the adult world may demand such things as expository writing I can't teach it by teaching it, if you see what I mean. I have to follow the natural development of children's language; with some children it may lead me to a form of language use which may find expression in the particular adult form called expository writing. Many children will not reach that stage because of the stance they take to their experience and the way that stance is mediated through language. It would be impossible

to teach expository writing as a series of abstracted techniques to children who cannot organise their experience in that particular way.

Perhaps I had better say what I do in writing - this is not just in working with students. I participate in quite a number of teachers' courses and projects over a wide area and I have some language programmes on trial in schools. I believe that I can demonstrate that most children have sufficient vocabulary range and syntactical command to meet the basic demands of school. If they cannot meet these demands it must be because they do not choose to deploy the language ability they have. Why should this be so? It can only be because they see these demands as being irrelevant; they cannot value the particular uses to which school puts language. These uses cannot be important within the social groups from which these children come. Language is a social habit; it will reflect habits and values of the group. Because its use is habitual the child may not appreciate that there are other ways of using language ¢different@ from those common within his group. The topic that interests me first of all is how a child communicates his own experience to some one else. This is a form of language that we may take for granted but it may not be developed in many homes. Many Many parents are just not interested in the child reporting on his experiences; they are more interested in the child simply saying what he did. The child may therefore <u>name</u> events -- not <u>describe</u> events. The child will be communicating in a face to face situation where he will depend on feedback from an auditor to elicit what the auditor is interested in. Many of the events he describes will be part of the common experience of both speaker and listener; there is little need for the speaker to be precise; the mere naming is enough as the listener will fill out the details from his own experience. The speaker's response to the experience may be communicated by a series of stereotypes -- 'great', 'smashing', 'fabulous'. Again the listener will be able to complete the act of communication. It is unlikely that these children or theirparents will value reading very highly. They will not have internalised the characteristics of the written word and it will not provide them with that abstracted sense of audience or that selection and control over the act of communication that is another aspect of reading. When this child begins to write he will simply 'write talking'. It will be a spontaneous, self-centred act and we will probably find the following features: random selection of items; dependence on nominals rather than on descriptive words, e.g. adjectives, adverbs; dependence on linking or saying verbs; little explicit demonstration of relationship between events - dependence on simple co-ordination; events organised at best in chronological

sequence and at worst incoherence and digression, errors of "correctness".

I chose to call this kind of writing 'centred' as it represents a particular stance to experience in which the child is at the centre of his experience and has little sense of what is necessary for an effective act of communication. The growth points on which I have to work if I want to move the child forward are: a) the selection of items which are important within the experience - to other people as well as to himself (a sense of audience); b) more explicit recall of sensory and affective experience; c) more logical structure - at first chronological sequence; d) more explicit demonstration of relationships; e) correctness.

I will tend to work on sensory and affective recall first as that is rather easier and then the development of a satisfactory sequence within the story. I develop these particular areas by sharing my expectations with the child when we discuss his work - particularly emphasising what people might expect to hear and trying to get him to realise that all people have not shared his experience; [by] the discussion of poetry or prose that act as good models; [by] controlled writing activities that help develop specific skills that may be of value in the precise communication of experience; [by] structured activities that are designed to help the child organise his work - I use pictures a great deal for this.

I believe that there is a sequential development in language and that there are strong links between talking, writing and reading. I really teach talking and writing through reading. I have to help the child internalise the characteristics of writing - that's what his teachers have done. I have to be able to make some kind of rough diagnosis of where a child is and have a fair idea of what the next step is and know the kind of activities that lead from one to the other. This sense of growth points is critical. I don't believe that each child is unique in the sense that children do not inhabit huge areas of common experience. The content of what they write may vary - but the way they use writing to organise their experience and relate to that experience does not vary to the same extent.

What I am doing is moving children on to the next stance to experience and this I call 'deep-centred'. I am still concerned with the child recalling and communicating his experience but as the name suggests he is able to go more deeply into that experience. I expect him to have a more highly developed sense of audience and this will mean a much more explicit recall of his experiences and of his response

to them. The development here is not so much linguistic as in the way the child relates to his own experience. First I have to get him to recall his experience in detail; then I will probably get him to discuss relationships between events in his experience. I would then get him to discuss the significance of the events for him and finally I would try to get him to use past experience to anticipate what he might do in the future. The use of reading and discussion centred on visual material is important here.

I would hope to get all children on to this 'deep-centred' stance. To me all forms of language are simply differentiations within a strongly based personal language - they are not discrete forms of language - like expository writing. No matter what stage of class I take over I would want to test its ability to communicate first-hand experience. If they can't get that right then I don't think they can get anything else right.

Another kind of language I am working to get the child to use is 'distanced' language - that is language used outside the context of action. I believe that the development of this kind of language is an important aspect of education.

I would probably start with stories. Children like to tell stories and strangely enough their stories may be more tightly organised than their recall of their own experience. This may be because the social group provides more models of what a story is than it does of how to communicate first-hand experience. These stories are fantasies - they are not acts of imagination. We can only imagine what is imaginable and children may not have the data or the sensitivity to other people to hold an imaginative stance to experience - i.e. inhabiting someone else's reality. I get children writing stories. The emphasis may be on actions and on the suspension of reality. Into these stories I have to begin to get data drawn from the child's own experience; this is the same kind of thing as is happening in the child's recall of personal experience. Reality has to 'thicken up' the fantasy. I probably won't get much of that before about nine years of age. It seems to me to be a turning point. Children begin to develop a keener sense of the 'otherness' of other people round about that time and this helps develop the imaginative use of language. I can only set them to imagine those things of which they have knowledge for imagination feeds on knowledge but this use of language is much helped by reading and by dramatic activity. Children are now able to inhabit another stance to reality - the 'other-centred' stance. They can begin to look at their experience from points of view other than their own and I

encourage this not only by imaginative work but by structuring activities so that they have to view common experience from unusual points of view. Fiction is a powerful agent here. There is another form of imaginative language and that is involved in speculation - pushing out from the known into the posible. I prefer to develop the ability to speculate through spoken language activity - it is more flexible and more economical. There are all sorts of things that can be done here - inferential reading, interpretation of pictures, construction of hypotheses on given data, deduction of principles, speculation on function of objects, etc. Through imagination and speculation I encourage children to use their experience to move beyond the context of action. Obviously other features already developed, like precision in definition or logical structure are important here. The next stance I try to develop probably won't appear until secondary school - if it appears at all. This stance seems to me to be more related to intellectual capacity than the others. I call this the 'de-centred' stance. Here children have to stand outside their own experience and hold an objective stance. This is difficult as people tend to mediate new experience through the old; they will tend to make a personal response. I have to try to get children to recount experiences - not as they saw them - but as they always are. This is not easy and again it depends a great deal on access to written models and the internalising of a variety of structures. This is the most difficult stance to develop and the language through which it is mediated makes use of most of the language skills already developed. It is within this stance that I would expect to find the particular form expository writing emerge but I couldn't teach expository writing unless the child had been able to hold all these stances and had developed the appropriate language skills.

If I can get children to hold these stances to experience then they can use language spontaneously to respond to immediate experience; they can recall and communicate their own experience; they can reflect on their own experience; they can use past experience to illuminate the present and anticipate the future; they can inhabit other people's reality; they can look at their own experience from other points of view; they can push out from the known to the possible; they can look at experience objectively. If they can do that then they can do anything that society has any right to ask me to develop as a language teacher. If they can do these things they can handle descriptive, narrative or expostory writing; they can write reports, letters, stories, personal accounts, etc. These things are unimportant in themselves. They are simply forms through which the stances may find expression. If children inhabit

the stances it is easy to teach them the forms; if they don't inhabit the stances then you cannot teach them the forms.

To finish - I believe that the Catch 22 of language teaching is that you can't change language unless you change the child using the language. Children have linguistic ability that they do not deploy because they are socially habituated not to. There is a sequential development in language that relates to the child's individual and social development. There are close links between talking, reading, and writing. There are growth points in a child's use of language that lead him from one stance to another. Some of these may be identified through linguistic markers; others are identified by the relationship which the child holds to the material. The movement to higher stages of language use does not mean that lower stages are displaced; they co-exist and earlier forms will manifest themselves, particularly in alien or unstabilised situations. A child who can maintain the four stances to experience will meet the language demands of school. The most difficult stances are those that are mediated through language outside the context of action. The internalising of the characteristics of written language is necessary to hold some of these stances effectively. The linguistic items that a child cannot deploy in speech and writing are precisely those which will create difficulty for him in reading. Higher forms of cognitive ability will depend on the child's access to the linear sequence of written language. The development of language will depend on the recognition of the essential coherence of talking, reading and writing and on growth points within a sequential development; it cannot be achieved by programs composed of the accumulation of discrete items or by a simple exposure to language.

CONCLUSION

The information in this chapter is only an inventory of some recent studies and practices relating to the teaching of composition and the training of composition teachers. Particular items have therefore been presented without evaluative comment; furthermore, they have been described without reference to the many related contexts and conditions that would affect their relevance to the Ontario system -- such matters as certification requirements, curriculum guidelines, textual materials, examination practices, streaming policies, pupil-teacher ratios, and training programs. Each reader may accordingly judge for himself the potential usefulness of the various items, taking into consideration whatever particular contexts and conditions may be appropriate. As the scope of the information in this chapter thus precludes discursive conclusions as to the merits of particular ideas and practices, the four recommendations which follow are correspondingly limited in design. They are intended merely to draw attention to a selection of practices which may be especially worthy of fuller consideration -- or reconsideration -- by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. Each recommendation will be accompanied, however, by a brief comment indicating its possible relevance to the Ontario system.

Recommendation

We recommend that the Ministry of Colleges and Universities establish an independent advisory

Council on English similar in organization and purpose to Scotland's Committee on English. (See Part III B above.)

Comment

A Council of this kind would consist of members of the profession drawn from all sectors of Ontario's educational system. It would be a permanent, statutory body, publicly funded yet independent of government. Its central mandate would be to conduct or commission studies on matters of common concern and to offer wise scholarly advice to the profession and Ministry on questions relating to the teaching of English in Ontario. Such a Council could also be charged with guiding the work of an Ontario Centre for information on Teaching English (as proposed in the following recommendation).

Recommendation

We recommend that the Ministry of Colleges and Universities establish an Ontario Centre for Information on Teaching English, similar in organization and function to the Centre for this purpose in Scotland. (See Part III B above.)

Comment

This organization would be responsible to an Ontario

Council of English as described in the preceding recommendation and would serve teachers throughout the Province by gathering and disseminating information on teaching English. Specifically, it would be charged with developing a library on teaching English and maintaining a postal lending-service to teachers throughout the Province. It would also exchange information on a continuing basis with similar organizations in jurisdictions outside of Ontario, assist with the editing and publishing of a professional journal, and organize conferences from time to time on matters of concern to English teachers. Such a centre would be located centrally in Ontario near a Faculty of Education and its staff would minimally consist of a secretary, librarian, and director.

Recommendation

We recommend that programs be established to provide in-service training for teachers in the areas of language and especially writing.

Comment

The value of in-service training is self-evident. Although the Ontario Ministry has, in fact, sponsored such training in several subjects, including a program of three courses on teaching the language arts at the elementary level (K-8), little of this training has been concerned with the teaching of composition at the intermediate and senior levels. Information about courses of this kind in jurisdictions outside Ontario are listed above in

Part I C (see especially Quebec's "Programme de perfectionnement des maîtres en français") and Part II (the California Writing Project).

Recommendation

We recommend that the Ministry of Colleges and Universities establish a computerized system for bibliographical information on the teaching of English.

Comment

Teachers in Ontario now lack a well-organized system for the analysis, storage, retrieval and dissemination of bibliographical information about the teaching of English. The technical facility for such a system already exists in the form of the ONTERIS Computer with terminals in Faculties of Education and secondary schools throughout the Province. Initially, the program for this system might be based on the items and abstracts in the Bibliography of this Report. The program could be further developed by commissioning an appropriate agency to (a) prepare and maintain a subject index useful to practising teachers, (b) write abstracts of all Canadian studies on the teaching of composition completed after 1976, (c) negotiate an exchange of computerized bibliographical information with such agents as the Educational Resources Information Center in California (see the introduction to the bibliography of this Report) and (d) maintain

a central registry of Canadian research-in-progress on the teaching of composition.